Fresh study of the fourth gospel.
226.5 H632f
10306
Hitchcock, Francis Ryan Montgo
Life Pacific College Alumni Library

REV. F. R. M. HITCHCOCK

DATE DUE

JAN 7 1985			

226.5
H632f

Hitchcock, Francis, Ryan Montgomery
A fresh study of the fourth gospel

LIFE Pacific College
Alumni Library
1100 West Covina Blvd.
San Dimas, CA 91773

DEMCO

A FRESH STUDY
OF THE
FOURTH GOSPEL

BY
REV. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK,
M.A., B.D.,
DONNELLAN LECTURER, T.C.D., ETC.,

AUTHOR OF "CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA," "MYSTERY OF THE CROSS," "SUGGESTIONS FOR BIBLE STUDY," "PRESENT CONTROVERSY ON PRAYER," "CHRIST AND HIS CRITICS," ETC., ETC.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TRACT COMMITTEE

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.
43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.
BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET
NEW YORK: E. S. GORHAM
1911

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	3
II.	THE CASE FOR THE GOSPEL	8
III.	THE PARTITION THEORY (WENDT'S) ...	55
IV.	THE ORGANIC UNITY OF THE GOSPEL ...	74
V.	THE CHARACTER DRAWING OF THE GOSPEL ...	86
VI.	THE DRAMATIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE GOSPEL	102
VII.	THE ARTISTIC STRUCTURE OF THE GOSPEL ...	115
VIII.	THE DEVELOPMENT OF ITS THOUGHT—PUBLIC DISCOURSES	143
IX.	THE DEVELOPMENT OF ITS THOUGHT—PRIVATE DISCOURSES	153
X.	THE BAPTIST AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL ...	170
XI.	THE LITERARY CONNEXION BETWEEN ST. JOHN AND ST. PETER	181

2F
LIFE Pacific College
Alumni Library
1100 West Covina Blvd.
San Dimas, CA 91773
L.I.F.E. College Library
1100 Glendale Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90026

A FRESH STUDY
OF THE
FOURTH GOSPEL

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

THE Gospel of St. John is pre-eminently the spiritual Gospel, as Clement of Alexandria described it. The deep truths of God are viewed as they should be, *sub specie eternitatis* in their relation to God and man and one whole body of truth. As Dr. Inge has recently said, "the Gospel is a compact whole."[1] But he proceeded: "Like most mystical works, its thought revolved round a few simple ideas, without orderly progress or sustained argument, but producing a powerful effect by cumulative illustration and slightly varied repetition." It will be my aim in the following pages to show that there is a distinct order and gradual development of thought in the public and private addresses and a similar development of action in the narrative portion.

The Gospel is a mystical book. It leads us into inner relations; inner life; inner light. But it is not all subjective. There is the objectivity of the "Word made flesh" all through. Although He is in us and we are in Him, the personalities are not confused. Though a part of Him, we are still apart

[1] Church of Ireland Conference.

023361

from Him. As Light, God manifests Himself in us; as Life, He energizes in us, galvanizing our latent activities into action; as Love, He unites us with Himself, and through Himself with the Heavenly Father and the human brother; as Spirit, He is indwelling, inspiring and illuminating, and is the medium of an eternal communion.

It is the eternal and the universal that appealed to the Evangelist. To the contemplative mind that loves to dwell on things behind the veil no Gospel can be dearer, although those very timeless and universal elements may make it a sealed book to many minds.

What our age requires is an independent study of the Gospel itself, not of the criticism of the Gospel. Canon Sanday, in his *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, has given an interesting and invaluable survey of recent literature on the subject. He makes the significant remark that "there are not wanting signs that a fuller examination of the relations between the teaching of Christ on the one hand, and St. Paul and St. John on the other, is the next great debate that lies before us. In this debate the question of the genuineness and authenticity of the Fourth Gospel will be but an episode."[1] It is indeed strange that in the controversy under the heading "Jesus or Christ" the fact has not been sufficiently emphasized that the purpose of this Evangelist is to affirm the personal identity of the historical Jesus of Nazareth with the risen Christ, which has been made clear to his own soul by the doctrine of the Logos. But this fact is due to the other fact that has not acted as a mere episode in the argument, namely, that even conservative writers have hesitated to use a Gospel of which their opponents would not allow them to assume the integrity and authenticity. There are still

[1] Preface, viii.

many conservative writers in the field who are not conservative because orthodoxy requires it, but because they have reasons of their own for believing in the unity of the Gospel and its Johannine authorship. It is high time that we abandoned the apologetic tone. The case for the Gospel is not weak; nay, it is as strong as that of any other. The work of Drs. Ezra Abbot and Westcott may be a good quarry for building material, but it is a mistake for conservative writers to think that the same arguments, no matter how adroitly and eloquently repeated, will always carry conviction. We want new and original workers, who prefer rather to dig and delve for themselves than to build on other men's foundations. Even if our theories be eventually discarded, the facts upon which we have constructed these theories will outlast, even as the Gospel has outlasted the assaults of criticism.

Canon Sanday criticizes, in his keen way, the methods and theories of many critics, chiefly those of the young school of German theology, Jülicher, Schmiedel, Wernle and Wrede. He refers gratefully to Dr. Drummond's *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, and Dr. Stanton's work, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*. He gives instances in which criticism has corrected itself, viz. the Ignatian Letters, Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa*, and the *Vita Antonii* of St. Athanasius. Such instances may give the recent school of criticism pause. He also points out that the treatment of the supernatural, which is a conspicuous feature of this Gospel, is no valid objection to its being a first-hand authority.

The imputation of conscious fraud cannot be too strongly deprecated. In more recent times the Pfaff fragments have been declared forgeries by Harnack, but they were suspected from the first by Maffei. It is a poor compliment to the intelligence of the critics of the second century to consider

that they permitted forgeries on a larger and more flagrant scale to pass muster. But it is not so much to prove the genuineness and authenticity of this Gospel as to meet the alleged want of development of action and doctrine that the present work has been undertaken. While it is our purpose to mark the stages of such development, it cannot be denied that in a measure we see the end from the beginning. And this would be, psychologically speaking, more intelligible if it were the work of a personal disciple, who, even if he wished to show the progress of events and evolution of doctrine connected with his Master, could not but anticipate and foreshorten both in his memoir, than if it were the composition of an outsider. The difficulty would be greater in the case of such a one as he attempted to trace the steps by which his own faith had been won. But even if due allowance is made for this foreshortening process, the Gospel as a whole presents one complete, harmonious picture. Its characters are consistently drawn; its teaching develops; its action advances; and its scenes are marshalled only with reference to the great purpose of the writer, which is ever in the background of his mind. "These [signs] are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye may have life in His Name." [1]

Of the partition theories, Wendt's has been selected as that which appears to be the most impartial, and because he seems to handle his subject with the greatest delicacy and reverence of all the German critics.

With regard to the Johannine authorship, it is hoped that the new light in which this Evangelist represents the Baptist, the former teacher of John the son of Zebedee, and the literary connexions between the writings attributed to St. John and

[1] John xx. 31.

St. Peter will corroborate the traditional view that the author was the son of Zebedee, the companion and friend of Peter.

Several of these chapters have already been published in various magazines—*Hermathena, Expositor* (2), *Homiletic Review* (2), the *Irish Church Quarterly,* and the *Church of Ireland Gazette*—to the editors of which the usual compliments are due. The others are new. In response to a request to have them in a more permanent form, they are now published in one volume.

It is trusted that it will be seen that the case against the Gospel has not been proven.

CHAPTER II

THE CASE FOR THE GOSPEL

GERMAN critics regard the Fourth Gospel as their happy hunting-ground. The Alogi, whom Epiphanius regards as "destitute of reason," and who ascribed the work to Cerinthus, were the first to call the authenticity of this Gospel in question. But during the last century many have sought to undermine the authority of a book which testifies so strongly to the Divinity of our Lord. That such efforts will continue to be made is the belief of those who feel with Bishop Lightfoot [1] that the decisive battle of Christianity will be fought over St. John's Gospel. It is well then that our people should be prepared in every way to meet the arguments with which hostile criticism plies them. And as Canon Sanday has pointed out, the tendency towards *rapprochement* which was characteristic of the eighties and nineties has been succeeded in recent years by conspicuous instances of denial both of the Apostolical authorship of the Gospel and of its historical character.[2]

In the first place we remark that though these critics start with the same prejudice against the Divinity of Jesus, they do not arrive at the same conclusions concerning the Gospel. Its very date is still an unsettled question. The more recent

[1] In letter to Dean Luckock.

[2] *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 25. He names Jülicher, Schmiedel, Wrede, Wernle, Réville, and Loisy.

critics, however, seem unanimous in choosing an earlier date than their predecessors. While Baur fixed its composition between 160 and 170, Pfleiderer placed it between 135 and 150; Hilgenfeld between 130 and 140; Schmiedel between 132 and 140; Harnack,[1] who assigns it to John Presbyter, said it might perhaps be allowed to be put as early as 110 A.D. We welcome this gradual approximation to our position.

The theories put forth concerning its nature and origin are no less discordant. Strauss declared it was founded upon myths embodying certain religious and political ideas which had grown up in the course of time. Baur held it was written with a "tendency" to reconcile the supposed opposite schools of John and Peter. Jülicher, in his *Introduction to the New Testament*,[2] says we must regard it as "a philosophical poem with a religious tendency." Pfleiderer described it as "a transparent allegory of religious and dogmatic ideas," [3] and is followed by Loisy and Réville, while Weiss,[4] who maintains the Apostolic authorship, believed that the writer handled his subject with much freedom. While the general opinion used to be that it was a Gnostic brochure of the second century, it is now believed to be the work of John the Presbyter, and to have been written about the end of the first century.

We state the case for the Gospel in the simplest manner possible.

(1) If the first three centuries furnish no evidence of the Johannine authorship of this work; (2) if its theology and philosophy are utterly beyond a writer of St. John's time; (3) if its narrative is irreconcilable with that of the Synoptists; (4) if

[1] In letter to Professor A. Robinson, 1898.
[2] p. 258.
[3] *Urchristentum*, ii. p. 389.
[4] *Introduction to the New Testament.*

the style and matter of the gospel of Christ in this Gospel are completely different from those of the others; and (5) if it could not possibly have been written by a Palestinian Jew of the first century and an eye-witness of the signs recorded, then we may accept the words of the author of *Supernatural Religion*—"the testimony of the Fourth Gospel is of no value towards establishing the truth of miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation." [1]

I. There is abundant evidence of an external nature for the Johannine authorship and authority of this Gospel in the Christian literature of the first three centuries. We have not space for every testimony. Working back from the end of the third century to the first, we shall find in Eusebius, in Clement of Alexandria, in Tertullian, in Irenaeus, in Tatian, in Justin Martyr, in Ignatius and Polycarp, sufficient proof of this point. According to the Church Historian,[2] it was the tradition that John wrote to confirm the truth of the three existing records, and also to supply what was lacking in them, a record of what happened in the beginning of things and at the commencement of the ministry of Christ, and that he was especially requested to give an account of the period which had been passed over in silence by the other Evangelists, and of the works our Saviour performed before the imprisonment of John the Baptist. "Matthew and John," he says, "alone have left written records of the conversations of our Lord. For Matthew having at the first preached to the Hebrews, as he was about to leave them, rendered his Gospel into the vernacular, deeming that such a memoir might atone in some measure for his absence. And when Mark and Luke had given the world their evangels, people say that John, who had hitherto used an oral Gospel, committed his to writing." This was written 300 A.D.

[1] Vol. ii. p. 476.

[2] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 24.

circ. Origen (185–251) says : " Of all the Scriptures the Gospels are the first-fruits, and the first-fruits of the Gospels is that according to John, the meaning of which only he can grasp who has leaned on the breast of Jesus." Clement of Alexandria, principal of the Catechetical school in Alexandria (190–200 A.D.), declares [1] that he had met teachers in his travels " who preserved the true tradition of the blessed teaching directly from Peter and James, John and Paul, handing it down from father to son." A passage from a lost work of the same author, preserved by Eusebius, is to the effect that " John, finding that the human element had been adequately set forth in the Gospels, urged by his friends and inspired by the Spirit, composed a spiritual Gospel." The Muratorian Fragment (200 A.D.) mentions this Gospel as canonical. Tertullian (200 A.D. *circ.*) is also a strong witness for this Gospel, for he quotes from almost every chapter ; and his language leads us to infer that not only was the Gospel itself in circulation, but that translations of it had gained a footing. For example, he protests against the rendering of Logos by " Sermo " ; it should be translated " Ratio," according to him. Irenaeus (170–190 A.D.), who had no misgivings as to the Johannine authorship, declares that " John the disciple of our Lord, who lay in His bosom, afterwards published a Gospel when living in Ephesus." [2] This could not be " the Presbyter " of his Fourth Book. He also states that " he wrote to refute the erroneous views that Cerinthus was spreading." [3] The fact that Montanus and the Gnostic heretics Basilides and Valentinus employed the very words of St. John's Gospel in building up their systems, while Celsus [4] attacked the theology of the Gospel, is an indirect testimony to its popularity and

[1] *Str.*, ii. 2.
[2] *Adv. Hæreses*, iii. 1, 2.
[3] *Ibid.*, iii. 11, 1.
[4] 180 A.D.

authority, which could not have obtained without some examination of its credentials. In 1886 an Arabic version of the *Diatessaron*, or Harmony of the Four Gospels, by Tatian, who wrote A.D. 170 *circ.*, was found, and an examination of its contents proved conclusively that its author was acquainted with St. John's Gospel. Heracleon, a famous Gnostic, wrote a commentary on this Gospel about the same time. In the memoirs of Justin Martyr, the teacher of Tatian, which are mainly founded upon the Synoptic records, we find the distinctive doctrine of the Fourth Gospel, the doctrine of the Logos, somewhat altered, it is true, by the influence of Greek philosophy; and His Incarnation.[1] The letters (110 A.D. *circ.*) of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, have frequently a Johannine ring, *e.g. Romans*, vii. 2, *Magnesians*, viii. 2, which may prove, as Von der Goltz holds, that "he must have come under the influence of a community itself influenced by Johannine thought." And Polycarp, a contemporary of the Apostles, according to his pupil Irenaeus, used to describe his conversations with John, whom Irenaeus did not confound with the Presbyter, and with the others who had seen the Lord, and to relate their very words. "And in every respect," Irenaeus adds, "these recitals concerning our Lord and His miracles, having been received from eyewitnesses of the life of the Word, tallied with the Scriptures."[2] Papias also is said to have been his pupil. The *Didache* has the expression "make perfect in love."[3] Barnabas[4] has an apparent reference to John iii. 14. *Pastor* of Hermas[5] has also many echoes of the Gospel. Jerome gives a quotation[6] from the Gospel in Clemens Romanus. But it is not to be found there.

[1] *Apol.*, ii. 68, 95, 98.
[2] Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 20.
[3] John xvii. 23.
[4] *Ibid.*, c. xii.
[5] *Sim.*, ix. 12.
[6] John xviii. 22, 23.

This is a portion of the external documentary evidence from the third century, when the Canon was practically closed, back to the latter end of the first, to the authority and genuineness of this Gospel, which is sufficient to refute Reuss' statement that "the unspeakable pains that have been taken to collect external evidence only show that there is none in the proper sense of the term."

II. The next point to establish is that the theology and philosophy of this Gospel were not beyond a writer of the apostolic school. As Weizsäcker says, what most critics stumble at is "John's regarding his whole former experience as a life with the Incarnate Logos of God." The Fourth Gospel is confessedly different from the other three. That it has long been acknowledged to be so is shown by the words of the Muratorian Fragment, which breaks off with the remark that this difference of order and style should not disturb the believer, inasmuch as "the same glorious truths of the Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection and Advent of the Saviour are put forth in all by the same guiding Spirit." [1] What we have undertaken to prove is that it is an original work both in subject-matter and in authorship.

Years of active ministry and sacred contemplation in the reign of Trajan were given to the aged Apostle after his own transportation to Patmos and the departure of the other apostolic men. The statement of Irenaeus is that this Gospel was written in Ephesus. The same authority also informs us that John was there involved in a bitter controversy with Cerinthus, who represented Jesus as the son of Mary and Joseph, chosen by God to be the Messiah on account of his holy life and united at his baptism with the aeon Christ, who worked miracles through him, but withdrew from him before

[1] *History of the New Testament*, p. 223.

his crucifixion into the pleroma of God. It is not strange then, when the mental and spiritual environment of the last years of the Apostle's life had undergone so great a change from that of the previous generation, to find his Evangel different from the others. He had been led deeper by the pressing need of the moment into the truths of revelation, and he had been taught to realize more fully the Personality of the Word and of the Holy Spirit, and to impart a new significance to the *Memra* or Word of the Jews and the *Logos* or Reason of the Greeks. The human genealogy of the Master having been already given by Matthew and Luke, "John," Eusebius says,[1] "began from the theology which had been reserved by the Spirit for him, as the most capable of them all." According to the Muratorian Fragment, which is supposed to date from the close of the second century, "the Fourth Gospel was written by John, one of the disciples. When his fellow-disciples and bishops earnestly pressed him, he said: 'Fast with me from to-day for three days, and let us tell one another any revelation that may be made either for or against this matter.' On the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the disciples, that John should relate everything in his own name, and that the others should review his work."

The tradition, therefore, is that this Gospel was written at the urgent request of his fellow-disciples and bishops. This choice was no ill one. New heresies had arisen, novel theories of Christ and His Personality had been started, the system of the Gnostics had taken root. Accordingly a man was wanted who would be fully equipped by maturity of intellect and personal knowledge of the Master to adapt the teaching of Jesus to the theological ideas and aspirations of the age; and to counteract,

[1] *H. E.*, iii. 24.

if possible, the false tendencies of the times. In the fourth memoir we, therefore, find for the first time the simple Word of Life passing into a sublime Reason, and we see the historical facts of the life of Christ in the full-orbed and ever-present light of His Incarnation. Written in an atmosphere throbbing with philosophical discussions, amalgamations of Greek thought and Oriental speculation, and amid Gnostic surroundings, it is singularly free from Gnostic speculation and Hellenic ideas, and wonderfully true to the times of our Lord. The theology of the writer was assuredly in advance of the thought of the new century. It was not borrowed from Philo, for it was Messianic, nor was it Gnostic, for it does not reproduce the false dualism associated with that philosophy. It is to be compared with the matured philosophy of St. Paul in the Epistles to the Colossians and Philippians, and of the Epistle to the Hebrews in its Prologue. These works, like the Gospel, bear evidence of controversy, from which the others are singularly free. In the old man's declining years his pupils came to him for a fresh assurance of the faith once committed to the Saints and for a gospel that would be able to cope with the rationalism of Alexandrian Christianity, and for answer he drew a picture of the Word as he remembered Him in life, as He was presented to his vision, as he embraced Him in his soul, as he contemplated Him in His relations many and mysterious to the Father, the world and the Church, as he saw in Him the Conqueror of evil and the Light of men—a spiritual picture in which commonplace things are sanctified by contact with the Holy One of God, and in which graphic details proclaim an eye-witness. Using such terms as Logos—Philo's term, but not in Philo's sense—Life [1] and Light,[2] which were to hand, he describes the victory of the

[1] Ζωή. [2] Φῶς.

good. But there is no Gnostic dualism. Matter is not represented as evil, the Creation is made by the Logos, darkness is no hostile force, but the negation of light. Diabolic agency and demoniac influence are referred to, but are less conspicuous in this Gospel. The "father of lies" and "the prince of this world" are considerably shaken. The world is not beyond the reach of prayer or salvation or hope. Gnostic dualism disappears in the victory of the Faith. Nor is there aught of Docetism in this Gospel. It is the most antidocetic of all. The perfect humanity of Jesus, His weariness and wounds, tears and thirst are deliberately emphasized. After His Resurrection He offers a test of His reality to Thomas, and eats fish and bread.

The fact that the eschatological element—predominant in the Synoptists—is wanting is no argument against the genuineness and authenticity of this work. The last discourses have a prophetic ring, a forward-looking aspect; but the temple has been razed to the ground and the nation has been scattered. The Master's words have been literally fulfilled. But the grand application of those words to the course of the world, the World Apocalypse, takes the place of the Jewish Apocalypse. And the greatest Apocalypse of all is a real eschatology—or doctrine of the last things. If the writer had already recorded his views in an Apocalypse, there was no need for him to repeat the teaching of Christ on this subject, to which due prominence had already been given. The object of the Apocalyptic teaching of the Master was to impress upon men's minds the final victory of good and the defeat of evil. The place of this teaching, developed in the Apocalypse, is taken in the *Gospel* by the revelation of that Divine Person who said to His people, "I have overcome the world," and by the manifestation of the Divine Spirit, who will

"convince the world of sin, of righteousness and of *judgment.*"

With regard to the Alexandrian speculation of the Logos, with which this Gospel is supposed to be deeply imbued, it is sufficient to point out that the theological aspect and position of the Logos, which appears to be handled with originality in this Gospel, does not imply any great philosophical learning or training. The Apostle might easily have composed this passage on the Word without any personal acquaintance with Philo's writings, even although, as Grill has pointed out, the attributes of Christ in this Gospel are similar to those of Philo's Logos. The Jewish *Memra* or Word (which is found in the Targum of Gen. vii. 16, "The Lord protected Noah by His Word (*memra*)") would have prepared him for this new speculation. And so, when describing the Messiah in His pre-existent state, before He became Incarnate, he had no better term to use than that which was as old as the philosophy of the Stoa, and which had already become a platitude among the people of Ephesus since the arrival of Apollos, a Jew of Alexandria [1] (whose doctrine of Christianity varied from St. Paul's [2]), and which had been so skilfully employed by the writer of the Apocalypse as the name of the rider of the white horse.[3] Even if he had been deeply acquainted with Philonic speculation, he did not identify his Word with Philo's, but simply used material to hand to describe the union of God and Man in Christ, and the connexion of the Creator with the Creation. Furthermore, the Logos idea seems to have been introduced here with the special purpose, to correct that false theory of the Logos, that rationalism, rapidly spreading in the East in connexion with Christ, which denied that Jesus

[1] Acts xviii. 24–28. [2] 1 Cor. i. 12.
[3] ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ (xix. 13).

Christ came in the flesh. Against this docetic tendency the Apostle wrote his First Epistle, declaring emphatically that "every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit which confesseth not, is not of God." [1] The Word in the passage "the Word became flesh" must be taken in a personal sense. Such may or may not have been its technical sense, when used without an attribute, in the school of Philo. But in this sense it was surely employed by the writer of the Gospel. For he proceeds, in i. 15, to say, "John bare witness and cried, saying, This is He of whom I spake," and in vi. 62 and xii. 41, he alludes to the pre-existent glory of the Son of Man. Wendt [2] declares that John used the Word in an impersonal sense both in the Epistle [3] and in the Prologue of the Gospel, for if we regard the latter expression as implying personality, we create an impassable barrier between the Epistle and the Gospel. But it is quite plain that in the Epistle ἡ ζωή is personified: "And the Life was manifested, and we saw and bare witness of and announce to you the Eternal Life which was *with* the Father and was manifested to you." [4] "He is the true God and the Life Eternal." [5] It is also remarkable that the same preposition of relation, πρός, is used here as in the first verse of the Gospel: "The Word was *with* God." We are, therefore, justified in arguing that if Life was used in a personal sense in the Epistle, there can be no strong reason against the personal use of *Word* in the Gospel. It is true that in the majority of the passages in which Jesus spake of the Word of God,[6] He used it impersonally, and that He never speaks of Himself as the Word. There is, however, one passage in which a reference

[1] 1 John iv. 2–3. [2] *Das Johannesevangelium*, p. 214.
[3] "The word of the Life," τοῦ Λόγου τῆς ζωῆς. [4] i. 2.
[5] iv. 20. [6] v. 38; viii. 55; xii. 48; xiv. 24.

to His pre-incarnate state may be seen. It is x. 35, "If He called them gods to whom the Word of God came," [1] which might be translated, "into relation with whom the Word of God entered," this verb and tense being used of the historic manifestation of the Word.[2] This point, however, does not greatly affect the main question, which is: Did the Apostle use "Word," which is sometimes personal and sometimes impersonal in Philo, in an impersonal sense in the Prologue? Professor Wendt contends that he did. But the Apostle wrote, "The Word was *God*" not "Divine." [3] "And the Word became flesh, and tabernacled [4] among us, and we beheld His glory, glory as of the Only-begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth." This word cannot have been, at any rate, in the mind of the writer, "an impersonal revelation of God" [5] or "the oracular Word," which, according to Gen. i. 1 *ff.*, "God uttered when He created the world," [6] but was surely identified with the pre-existent Messias. An indirect proof of this statement is supplied by the fact that both the Prologue of the Gospel and the Prologue of the Epistle contain no distant echoes of the Transfiguration scene as recorded by the Synoptists. "We beheld His glory, glory as of the Only-begotten from the Father," and "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life." The past tense here, as Wendt remarks,[7] shows that it is no spiritual contemplation, which would be expressed in the present tense, but an historic manifestation to which reference is made. And that that manifestation was the so-called Transfiguration scene, regarding which St. Luke says,

[1] πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγένετο.
[2] ἐγένετο.
[3] Θεός not θεῖος.
[4] ἐσκήνωσεν.
[5] Wendt, *l.c.* p. 213.
[6] Jannaris, *Expository Times*, July, 1903.
[7] p. 190.

"they saw His glory,"[1] in which Peter cried, "Lord, let us make here three *tabernacles*," and at which the heavenly Voice said, "This is My beloved Son,"[2] is extremely probable. The writer of these prologues was, therefore, in all likelihood, one of the three witnesses of that wonderful change in the appearance of the Messiah, which, at any rate, did not attentuate Him to an impersonal concept.

Here we touch upon the fundamental difference between the Logos of Philo and the Logos of John. The former was a philosophic idea; the latter is a Divine Activity. The dominant note of the Prologue is the creation, redemption, and revelation wrought by the Son of God. This is the manner in which Goethe renders it: "In the beginning was the *Word*, nay, in the beginning was the *Thought*, nay, in the beginning was the *Power*, nay, in the beginning was the *Act*." Philo also used the term "Paraclete"; but in his system, which is dualistic, it was the Cosmos, not the Spirit or the Logos, that is Paraclete. We may conclude with the words of Harnack, "Even the Logos has little more in common with that of Philo than the name."[3]

There were many avenues besides the books of Philo, by which this writer could have had access to this doctrine of the Logos already formulated by St. Paul in the Colossians, and by the writer to the Hebrews.[4] It is significant that this doctrine

[1] δόξαν. [2] ἀγαπητός = μονογενής. [3] *History of Dogma*, p. 97.

[4] There are many parallels between St. John's and St. Paul's presentation of the Christ and the Holy Spirit; *e.g.* John i. 14; Rom. viii. 3; Phil. ii. 8. Both start from the Incarnation. Both regard the Son as Revealer of the Father (2 Cor. iv. 4–6; John xiv. 7–10). Both speak of the indwelling Spirit (Rom. viii. 9–11; John xiv. 17, 18). In both the Spirit is the Spirit of the Incarnate. In both we have data for the development of a doctrine of the Trinity. So many theological resemblances are there that the school of criticism represented by Wernle regards St. Paul as original and St. John as his follower and imitator (*Beginning of Christianity*, pp. 262–274). But St. Paul did not regard himself as the founder of the theology of the Church. In

only appears in the Prologue and not in the Gospel proper, of which Life, Light, and Spirit are the leading ideas. But this is probably due to the fact that the Prologue was written afterwards, as an author's Introduction or Preface is nowadays, giving a summary of the positions assumed, or arrived at, or elaborated in the Gospel.

III. There is also a marked difference in the narrative of events between the Fourth and the Synoptic Gospels. This difference has led to doubts as to the authenticity of this work. Eusebius referred to this point in the passage quoted above from his history,[1] where he states that it was the object of John to supplement the narrative of the Synoptists where it was incomplete, and that he wrote with a theological purpose. It was for this reason that John devoted himself to the ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem and Judaea before and after the imprisonment of the Baptist. Without this ministry the Synoptic records are unintelligible. This also explains the lacunae in this Gospel. For why should He withdraw from Judaea because John had been put in prison [2] or betrayed [3] to Herod, unless

Gal. ii. 2 he states that he submitted his views to the leading Apostles, James, Cephas, and John, who gave him the right hand of fellowship, a sign of their approval. His exposition may have influenced John in a greater or less degree. But this does not affect the latter's independent testimony. Canon Sanday says, "The two great Apostolic cycles stand majestically apart. There may be a connexion between them, but it is a connexion in the main underground" (*Criticism*, p. 232). Even if one cannot go so far as this, if, on the contrary, one finds the fundamental principles and seeds of thought of St. John in the Pauline Epistles, which were widely read in the cities of his own episcopate, it need not cause surprise or misgiving. The influence of St. Paul may help to explain the difference between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. This would not run counter to the facts of the New Testament and the traditions of the early Church, and yet it would not introduce St. Paul as the man who founded Christianity, but only as one who formulated its theology—a very different thing.

[1] iii. 24. [2] Mark i. 14. [3] Matt. iv. 12.

He feared a similar betrayal owing to a dangerous rivalry[1] with John? John alone records the five visits at Jerusalem, and thus throws light upon the exclamation in St. Luke's Gospel, "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *how often* would I have gathered thee as a hen gathereth her chickens!" But there are many apparent and real divergences. The first calling of the disciples, for example, which is placed by John in Judaea, seems to have taken place in Galilee, according to the Synoptists. But if the accounts are compared, they do not appear self-contradictory. St. John does not tell us that he and Andrew and Simon accompanied our Lord to Galilee. We are told that they abode with Jesus *that day*, but nothing further. They may have preceded Him to Galilee to pursue their occupation as fishermen, while Jesus followed leisurely with the object of making more disciples. And some days afterwards, as He was teaching by the lake, not casually, but with the definite purpose to reveal Himself more fully to those who were to be His chief disciples, He entered into Simon's ship and made manifest to one He had already accepted His holiness and His power. And Peter's exclamation, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord," would lead us to assume some previous knowledge of Jesus. This is a natural order of events and one with which all four records are in perfect harmony. If the Judaean ministry is presupposed in the Synoptic records, the Galilean is presupposed here.

Another discrepancy consists in the date of the purification of the Temple, which John placed in the forefront of the Master's mission and the Synoptists at its close. But it is quite possible to believe that the Temple required and received a second purification. Furthermore, in certain important details the purifications are different. The action

[1] John iv. 1.

of the Saviour in the Fourth Gospel is more vigorous, but his language is less offensive to the Jews than that employed on the last occasion, while St. Matthew's account of the false witness corroborates John's position regarding the purification. It is hard to say whether such an action would occur more appropriately at the beginning or at the end of His mission.

With regard to the record of the Last Supper, there is so serious a difference in the Gospels that some hold that St. John deliberately corrected a false impression left by his predecessors ; while others maintain that the references to the feast in the Synoptics are to the mid-day meal on feast-day—the *Chagigah*, or the *Kiddush* or sanctification which preceded great festivals. The Synoptists seem unanimous in making the Supper synchronize with the Passover, while John, who has the support of Greek custom and Jewish traditions, makes it occur on the Eve of the Passover, the *Erebh Pesach*, so as to cause the Crucifixion to fall between the two evenings and coincide with the hour of the killing of the victims. The manner in which the Synoptists reproduce, more or less clearly, the same form of words—" And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the Passover, His disciples said unto Him, Where wilt Thou that we go and prepare, that Thou mayest eat the Passover ? " [1] points to the use of a document common to all three. The controversy is, therefore, considerably narrowed down, so that it lies between the Gospel of St. John and the documentary authority followed by the Synoptists. The latter must have been of apostolic origin and was doubtless that taken down by Mark, who acted as the interpreter of Peter. And as the Synoptists are equally unanimous in representing

[1] Chwolson states that " the first day of the feast of unleavened bread," never means the fourteenth day, but the fifteenth day.

the day on which our Lord suffered as the day of Preparation or the day before the Sabbath,[1] and thus fall into line with the record of the Fourth Gospel, the discussion is centred in the issue between St. Mark's expression—"And the first day of the unleavened bread, when they killed the Passover"; and St. John's—"Now before the feast of the Passover"; the debate naturally turning on the possible identification of the words "the first day" and "before." It is possible that Mark may have misunderstood Peter, who naturally spoke in Aramaic, in which language the words for "first"[2] and "before" would be very similar in sound; or it is possible that "first"[3] may have here the meaning "before," which it has in John i. 15 and xv. 18, and so we might read "on the former day of unleavened bread," *i.e.* "on the day before the feast of unleavened bread."[4] But this is only conjecture, and the fact remains that there is a discrepancy, which, however, might be explained away by an appeal to the original languages.[5] The four Evangelists are, however, unanimous that Jesus suffered on the 14th of Nisan, after having prepared the Paschal Supper, but without the *lamb*, which may have been reserved for the next evening.

On the whole, the differences in the narratives

[1] Matt. xxvii. 62; Mark xv. 42; Luke xxiii. 54.

[2] *Kadmoyo*, Matt. xxvi. 17; *K'dom*, John xii. 1.

[3] πρῶτος, Mark xiv. 12[illegible].

[4] Another apparent discrepancy is the account of the Crucifixion, which took place, according to St. John (xix. 14), "about the sixth hour" (12 M.), and according to St. Mark on "the third" (9 A.M.). But there is no need to suggest a corruption of F. for Γ. or *vice versâ*, as the latter is the hour of sentence and the former the hour of crucifixon between which some interval must have elapsed (art. "Dates," by present writer in Hastings' *D.C.G.*).

[5] Schmiedel regards this point as crucial, but considers that the Fourth Gospel is wrong. But Professor Burkitt, who opposes the historicity of the Gospel, holds the writer to be right here.

prove that the narrators were not afraid of injuring their subject by taking up an independent line. Had their work been identical throughout, they would have been open to the suspicion of copying or collusion. As it is, they represent four different aspects of the Christ and His work, which are equally valuable and beautiful, and, broadly speaking, identical, and no one of which is to be honoured to the exclusion of the others.

It is also to be noted that when the writer differs from the other Evangelists, he does so deliberately and evidently with authority. Generally speaking, there are points in this Gospel—undesigned coincidences with the Synoptic memoirs—which serve to confirm both, as well as many explanatory notes which throw light on the previous records. It has been mentioned that the Judaean ministry, to which the Fourth Evangelist devotes himself, explains the position of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, leading to His removal to Galilee and the bitter opposition of the Jews, which could hardly have been provoked by His work in Galilee ; while the raising of Lazarus, omitted by the other recorders, is necessary to understand the precipitate action of the Jewish Sanhedrin.

The framework of the Gospel is more complete than that of the other Gospels. It gives us an idea of the duration of the Lord's mission to the Jews by mentioning the Passover and other feasts which He attended.[1] But while the Synoptists only suggest the termini of our Lord's birth and crucifixion, there are no less than seven leading notes of time[2] in the Fourth Gospel between the Baptism

[1] St. Mark alludes to two springs: ii. 23 ; vi. 39.

[2] ii. 13, 23, " And the Jews' Passover was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." iv. 35, " Say ye not, There are yet four months, and then cometh harvest? " v. 1, " There was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." vi. 4, " Now (the Passover) the feast of the Jews was nigh." vii. 2,

and the Crucifixion, and twenty dated references, which are invaluable for the reconstruction of our Lord's ministry. The Evangelist has written with sufficient fulness to warrant the belief that he was an eye-witness of the events he narrated, and with sufficient accuracy to persuade us to adopt his order of time. In no other Gospel do we find such attention paid to minute particulars of time and number. The writer presents a not unusual combination of philosophical depth and methodical precision.

On the whole, this Evangelist seems to return to the facts, while giving a deeper view of the teaching of the Master, and unfolding the great drama of belief and unbelief with a more vivid realism. Writing amid the turmoil of a thousand speculations, the old man's memory returns to the life of the Christ, which he views as it rises from its Divine background above the level of human existence, and while his pen with bold, vigorous strokes depicts that wonderful and gracious Personality he forgets not those minute touches that recall the humanity of the Son of man at every turn. It is, however, a portrait, not a photograph; a Gospel, not a biography. He omits many things, therefore, and records others, such as the raising of Lazarus,[1] which had a distinct influence upon the issue.

"Now the Jews' feast of tabernacles was at hand." x. 22, "Then the dedication took place in Jerusalem." xvii. 1 "Jesus then, six days before the Passover, came to Bethany."

[1] In another place the significance of this miracle will be indicated. Here let it be noticed that Professor Burkitt (*The Gospel History*, pp. 221, ff.) regards the discrepancy between this Gospel and the Synoptic narrative (St. Mark's Gospel) as coming to a head in this story. "It is not a question of the improbability or impossibility of the miracle, but of the time and place and effect upon outsiders. In all its dramatic setting, I am persuaded it is impossible to regard the story of the raising of Lazarus as a narrative of historical events." Professor Burkitt uses the argument from silence. St. Mark omits the event, because he did not know of it, and he did not know of it because it never

Again, it is objected that the *dramatis personae* of the Fourth Gospel are new or newly described; that the themes are different, that the miracles have another significance, and that the great scenes of the Incarnation, Baptism,[1] Temptation, Transfiguration, Eucharist, Agony, and Ascension are omitted. But there are significant hints of, and cross-references to, these persons, subjects, and scenes, which show that they were not unknown to the writer. Nay, they receive an added light, a greater intensity in the pages of one in whose vision the presence of the Logos Incarnate threw a glory-cloud over all with whom He had to do, over all He did and all He said. The existence of such interesting personages as Nicodemus, Nathanael, and Lazarus, who are inimitably described in the Fourth Gospel, receives corroboration from the many hints of Jesus' friendships in the Synoptists.[2] Of the Virgin Mother there is but one passing glimpse, but that is of the Mary of the Synoptists. The portrait of John the Baptist is taken at a later date, and Caiaphas and Pilate are photographed in a different pose. But the personalities are the same. The miraculous birth of Jesus is implied in the wonderful Prologue of the Word-made-flesh. To the Temptation scene there are references: "The prince of this

happened. This is his line of argument. By parity of reasoning one might argue that the Transfiguration and the Agony in Gethsemane never occurred because this writer never mentions them; and that the parables of the Good Samaritan and the Prodigal Son were never given, because St. Mark omits them. But it is remarkable that the sisters of Lazarus are described in St. Luke (x. 38–42) in a similar manner, and that that authority represents the home of these sisters in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, and it is no less remarkable that St. Matthew describes the Jews as *sealing* the stone of the tomb of Jesus.

[1] Professor Burkitt alleges that "the central incident," the actual baptism of Jesus by John, is altogether left out. It is, however, distinctly implied in the narrative in John's testimony to the descent of the Spirit on Christ.

[2] Luke vii. 26; viii. 3; xix. 5.

world cometh, and hath nothing in Me," and "I have meat to eat that ye know not of." . . . "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me," [1] and "God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." [2] To the Transfiguration there is doubtless an allusion in "We saw His glory, the glory of the Only-begotten." [3] Of the Eucharist there is a spiritual commentary in the sixth chapter.[4] On the Passion in Gethsemane some light is thrown by the saying, "The prince of this world cometh," [5] and, "Over the brook Kedron was a *garden*, into which He entered and the disciples . . . for Jesus ofttimes resorted thither with His disciples." [6] To the Ascension there are two references: "Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man;" [7] "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascending where He was before?" [8] Again, the miracles of the Synoptic records are wrought in infinite compassion for human suffering, called forth by the direst human necessity, while the chief "signs" of the Fourth Gospel seem done to attract men to His Person and His claims.[9] But while

[1] John iv. 32. [2] John iv. 24. [3] John i. 14.

[4] This has caused some hostile criticism; Professor Schmiedel objecting that the Eucharistic Supper was given a year before its time and Professor Burkitt urging that "John has transferred the Eucharistic teaching to the earlier Galilean miracle," and that by his omission of the Institution of the Last Supper—which, however, must have been known to every catechumen in the days the Gospel was composed—"he creates a false impression of the scene." It seems that adverse criticism will not allow itself to be satisfied with this Gospel. But probability is in favour of our Lord having given such preparatory teaching on the Holy Communion which was omitted in the Synoptic Gospels, and as John wrote with the previous records before him, he naturally would insert what had been omitted by others and omit what had been inserted, giving, however, certain incidental hints which help to fill in the picture.

[5] John xiv. 30. [6] xviii. 1. [7] i. 51. [8] vi. 62.

[9] Canon Sanday (*Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 183) has pointed out that the old argument against the genuine nature

they do so, some were also wrought in answer to the request of men, and no picture in the Synoptists is more touching in its reality than that of the weeping Saviour by the grave of Lazarus. The standpoint is different, but the subject is the same. Similarly in His teaching. In the Synoptists it is the proclamation of the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven ; in the Fourth Gospel it is the revelation of the love of the Father in the life of the Son, and the Life and Light and Love of God, as manifested in the Word. While the expression of St. Matthew's Gospel: "For He said, I am the Son of God," [1] is as high a claim as any in the Fourth Gospel, the formula of the doctrine of the Trinity, developed in the Fourth Gospel, is given in Matt. xxviii. 19 and 2 Cor. xiii. 14. The gift of the Spirit [2] and the promise of the presence of Christ [3] are common to both Synoptists and this writer. In no Gospel is the atoning self-sacrifice of the Lamb of God and the death of the Shepherd [4] so vividly and constantly before the reader's mind as in this.[5] The

of a book, such as the *Life of Antonius* by Athanasius, because of the miraculous element it contains, must be reversed. If the genuine nature of a book is established by internal and external evidence, we must make what we can of the miracles it records. The miracles of the Gospels were certainly believed by the men who recorded them. That it was not to the superstitious imagination of the author of the Fourth Gospel that they appealed is apparent from the precise notes of number and description that introduce the miracles. The beggar of Bethesda was thirty-eight years in his infirm state ; the disciples had rowed five and twenty or thirty furlongs when they saw Jesus walking on the sea ; the blind man was blind from his birth ; there was much grass in the place where the five thousand were fed ; there were six waterpots of stone containing three firkins apiece at the wedding feast. It is true that the symbolic nature of these miracles, which he calls "signs," chiefly appealed to the writer. They are symbolic in the sense that they are parables in action, that they illustrate the Lord's teaching, but not in the sense that they are fiction, as Schmiedel holds, invented designedly to enhance our Lord's personality.

[1] Matt. xxvii. 40, 43. [2] Luke xi. 13.
[3] Matt. xviii. 20 ; xxviii. 20. [4] *Cf.* Mark. x. 45 ; xiv. 27.
[5] *e.g.* John x 11.

Transfiguration scene recorded in the Synoptists only is the key to John i. 14, "We beheld His glory," etc. And the relation of the Father and the Son in John xvii., etc., is described in similar language in Matt. xi. 27, "No man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." And all three record that deep saying, "Whosoever receiveth Me, receiveth not Me, but Him that sent Me." [1]

IV. We now come to the question of style and subject-matter. Writing at a later date and in a period of great intellectual stir, St. John presented the discourses of his Master in a form that was better adapted than that of the Synoptists to impress the mind of his age. The Teacher in the Fourth Gospel speaks in paradoxes rather than in parables, in meditations rather than in maxims. But we have in St. Luke and St. Matthew specimens of the language with which the Fourth Gospel has made us familiar. The words recorded by these Evangelists in connexion with the return of the Seventy [2] —"All things are committed unto Me by My Father, and no man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him"—might well serve as the text of the third chapter of the Fourth Evangel. Furthermore, the same teacher does not employ the same method and argument when addressing cultured and uncultured audiences. The difference of form is, therefore, largely due to difference of social and religious environment. In the Synoptic Gospels are enshrined the village sermons and homilies of the Master to the country-folk and fishermen of Galilee, set off with word-pictures and illustrations that were calculated to

[1] Mark ix. 37; Luke x. 16; Matt. xxv. 40.
[2] Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22.

impress their simple minds; while in the Gospel according to St. John we have the substance of the teaching of Jesus in His private interviews and in His conversations with His disciples. Of the former it is His Kingdom, of the latter He Himself is the theme. We might well imagine the Master discoursing in this way with Mary who had chosen "the good part"; but such language would have been too abstract and metaphysical for a Sermon on the Mount.

In his style, as in his spirit, St. John is to some extent a Hebraist, and so he is in touch with the Synoptists. The teaching of our Lord is described by Justin Martyr as consisting of "short, pithy, abrupt sayings." This description applies with special force to the gnomic and oracular sentences of the Gospel. In this Gospel the argument is concealed. There is apparently no analysis of thought, no syllogistic process, no logical movement here. The truth is developed by a series of separate propositions, vivid phrases, striking statements that are emphasized by repetition.[1] Pregnant, abrupt speeches of historical importance mark the transitions. The meaning grows, being intensified. The fact becomes a living reality as the author gives us his impressions of it, as he holds it in his hands and turns it over in his mind, and presents it in ever-changing colours and connections. His thought reverberates. There is here the concentration of an intense mind, a contemplative soul. The Hebrew parallelismus

[1] The writer, however, endeavours to avoid tautology or the repetition of the same word, *e.g.* in i. 11, 12, *παρέλαβον* becomes *ἔλαβον*; *τεθέαμαι*, v. 32, becomes *ἑώρακα*, in verse 34; *ἐστὶ μεθερμηνευόμενον* of verse 4, becomes *ἑρμηνεύεται* in verse 42; *ὑπὸ τὴν συκήν* (48) is changed into *ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς* (50); *βρῶσις* (iv. 32) becomes *βρῶμα* (v. 34); *υἱός* (iv. 50) becomes *παῖς* in 51; and *ὀψαρίων* of xxi. 10 becomes *ἰχθύων* in the next verse. These variations, which are for the purposes of euphony, show that the writer was not inattentive to the smallest details in the construction of his sentences.

gives poetical rhythm and musical vibration to the song of the seer. But the song has pathos—for it is the story of the rejection of the Word of God. "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not," is the sad refrain. And yet the soft and gentle cadences of the poet's melody hold us in a sweet suspense while the progress of spiritual thought and revelation, and the deepening of the plot, the gathering force of the conflict and the succession of events, artistically selected to mark the crises in the Messiah's life, lend a dramatic intensity to this wonderful book which rises above reason to vision, soars above time and space to the Infinite Love, and moves from Eternity to Eternity. What the Synoptists attained by a series of striking tableaux is achieved here by a style and method vivid and climacteric, and the result is that marvellous synthesis of the Word-made-flesh.

The grand conclusion of the matter, "We beheld His glory, glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father," is stated in the Prologue, and the book describes the slow but gradual process by which that faith was won and that vision grew upon the soul of the disciples. Ever and anon the gentle tide of meditation which flows from deep to deep is ruffled by that strange suspense, a Divine expectancy, an "hour" by God withheld, which reaches its highest point of intensity in the Garden, where the sublime calm of the Saviour finally dominates the current of the story. Like the Book of Job, the only work of the Old Testament which at all resembles it in form and spirit as a revelation of the Divine, in dialogues of dramatic force, this Gospel is a law to itself. Its sublimity is simple; and its simplicity is sublime. As the *Apocalypse* reveals in visions, it describes in dialogues the onward march of Life to its consummation. The cast of the thought is largely Hebraic. The writer's mind is trained in

Jewish symbolism and phrases. The metaphors are of the Old Testament pattern. The "Shepherd" and "Vine" of the prophets are reset and elaborated. The prelude of the Incarnation is expressed like an exordium of the Creation. The writer starts like a Jew from action—"My Father worketh hitherto" —not like a Greek, from thought. His is the record of a spiritual creation, while Genesis is the record of a natural world creation. And the book, as Bishop Lightfoot pointed out, so abounds in Aramaic idiom that it could almost be translated back into the popular language of the Jews of the first century, and according to one authority,[1] is, in fact, a translation of an Aramaic original. Against this view—which is supported by the simple juxtaposition of sentences and the use of (*καί*, and) — however, must be set the opinion of Dr. Abbott [2] and Dalman,[3] who excludes this Gospel from the scope of his enquiry "in what form the words of Jesus must have been uttered in their original language, and what meaning they had in this form, for the Jewish hearers," because, he says, "the author's individuality impressed itself so strongly upon the Greek he wrote that a reconstruction in Aramaic would have too little prospect of success." [4] It might be added that the writer of this Gospel was conversant with the most delicate shades of meaning of the Greek verbs. For instance, the Syriac of xxi. 17 uses the same verb for "lovest thou?" (*rochem at li*) while the Greek of St. John has two verbs, *agapas* [5] and *phileis*.[6] See also the manner in which the writer describes the sudden change of the beloved disciple's position during the meal. He has been

[1] Watkins, *Bampton Lectures*. [2] *Original Studies*, p. 142.
[3] *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 72. [4] *Ibid.*, c. p. 73.
[5] *ἀγαπᾶς*, a word implying a higher and more spiritual form of love.
[6] *φιλεῖς*, implying a lower and more ordinary form.

reclining quietly,[1] then he threw back his head [2] to ask a question.[3]

Furthermore, the peculiarity of the author's diction is hardly to be explained by a translation from another language. It has been pointed out that he makes our Lord utter some one hundred and forty words which he never used in his own person, while he employs nearly five hundred words which he never attributes to our Lord. And there are several peculiarities of our Lord's diction, including the repeated "Amen, Amen," which occur nowhere else.[4] Moreover, the structure of the Gospel on the whole is Greek. The cadences and periods prove no slight acquaintance with the iambic metre of the Greek drama. There are many passages which have a distinctly metrical ring, even if all the laws of metre are not observed,[5] and of which slight alterations would make tolerably good verses. The fact that the phrasing seems unconscious makes the phenomenon all the more striking. The metrical prose of this Gospel is an indirect proof of its unity. But these facts do not support the suggestion of a translation. It is not at all probable that any of the Gospels were written originally in Aramaic. The fact that our Lord used Aramaic expressions no more proves that Aramaic was His native language than a few Irish sayings in the works of a modern authoress prove that she is an Irish speaker. The

[1] ἀνακείμενος. [2] ἀναπέσων.

[3] Fresh revision of the New Testament, 1871–72. Lightfoot. The A.V. does not observe this distinction in John xiii. 23, 25.

[4] See art. "John's Gospel," Hastings' *Dict.*, ii. 719.

[5] In vi. 55, notice the balance of the clauses beginning ἡ γὰρ σάρξ and καὶ τὸ αἷμα. vi. 40, f. ἵνα πᾶς—ἡμέρᾳ corresponds to ὁ τρώγων—ἡμέρᾳ vi. 54, f. There are several almost pure iambi in the Gospel, *e.g.* ii. 9, διακόνοι—ἠντληκότες; ii. 15, τῶν κ . . , τὰ κέρματα; vii. 19, οὐ M.—νόμον; vii. 27, ὁ X . . . πόθεν, xv. 8, καρπὸν . . ἐμοί; xvii. 19, ἀπέκοψεν . . . δεξίον; xviii. 13, αὐτὸν . . . πενθερός; xx. 23, ἐὰν—ἁμαρτίας. And there are a large number of other passages which bear evidence of the influence of the Greek metrical system.

more obvious conclusion is that while the form of the author's thought was sometimes coloured by his native idiom, the instrument—the Hellenic language he used—was that which long training, practice, and culture in the Greek cities of his episcopate had made his own. With regard to the subject-matter of the Fourth Gospel, as compared with that of the other memoirs, there is not so much difference as development. It is the Gospel of spiritual life. In Him was the Life. It is the story of a wonderful, rather than a wonder-working, Personality, free from sin and kin to God, miraculous in the sense that its origin was Divine, not in the sense that it interrupted the course of nature, for it revealed the power and purpose of that course as it is in God. The writer was limited by his teleological purpose to certain aspects of his Master's life and work —His personal self-revelation and the effect of that revelation upon the world. The other memoirs may have been intended to be biographies. This is a Gospel. This self-imposed limitation serves to explain not only the fragmentary nature of the record, but also the seeming monotony of the discourses, a monotony which was almost inevitable considering that it was a specific presentation of the Christ that the writer sought to give, and yet which was more apparent than real, for each discourse was called forth by special circumstances and deals with a special topic.

The standpoint of the writer and his presentation of the Christ stamps this Gospel as original and one. It is distinctly individual. Whereas the objective element predominates in the Synoptists, who start from what our Lord was and taught and wrought, this story is told from the side of the observers. It records the impressions made by Jesus from the standpoint of those impressed. Its outlook is subjective and its interest is created by a

succession of psychological moments called "hours." And its narration is of the growth of faith in the disciples, of their views and visions of Christ, which reach their consummation in the grand confession of Thomas the sceptic. As the Corinthian Christians were St. Paul's Epistle, the disciples are here the Gospel of Jesus, "known and read of all men, written not with ink, but by the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in the fleshy tables of the heart."[1] For while the story is dominated by an intense personal interest, while the experiences it records are John's own, what he thinks and believes, what ideas are held of his dying, and what Jesus Himself said, the interest is extended to the psychological experiences of the other disciples; the very thoughts of their hearts are laid bare by graphic touches, their idiosyncracies are painted by word phrases as in no other Gospel, their motives are analyzed, their surprising "ignorances" are corrected in the light of a revelation afterwards received as the Spirit brought back to their memories the words and meaning of the Lord Jesus, their inner conflict between growing faith and doubt is pathetically but truly depicted, and their hesitation, trembling on the verge of a question which they long but fear to ask, is painted to the very life. This last corresponds to the amazement and fear on the last journey to Jerusalem, described by St. Mark,[2] and is a strong proof that the author was an eye-witness. The impressions the Lord Jesus made on His disciples are vividly pourtrayed as the disciple lives over his former experiences. But while brooding on the past he cannot tear himself free from the present. He is no longer the young student, content to see and know and love the Messiah, but the veteran saint who has beheld and believed, who has toiled and suffered, and is even now standing at the gate

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 3. [2] x. 32.

of the eternal city. He writes the history of his Master in the light of a faith afterwards attained, in the after-glow of a memory in which small details stand out like stars from the background of the past, pregnant with meaning, and in which the comments of years of reflection and interpretation are interwoven with the words and works, the doings and sufferings of long departed years around which hangs a halo of exquisite softness, affection, and divinity. Thus we find in the Gospel running notes of exposition from the hand of one who had been accustomed to love, to meditate upon and to expand the words of the Lord Jesus. And for all the lapse of years, the Master Himself—the central figure around whom surges the battle between faith and doubt, is no lay figure, but a living, breathing, quickening Personality, and the living, ever expanding movement He has started cannot be better expressed than by a living mind palpitating with early reminiscences and indelible impressions, in which the word uttered ever assumes new forms and new applications as the Spirit leads the Apostle into all the truth, and brings back to his remembrance all that the Master did and said and suffered, and all that His disciples experienced and believed. The memory of such a man was no mechanical gramophone, but a living organ vibrating with the Spirit of Jesus, and his soul was a divinely equipped medium for the revelation that "is spirit and is life."

Such a view and presentation of the Master explains to a large degree the difference of the subject-matter of the Fourth Gospel from that of the others. Whereas the theme of the Synoptists is the wonderful Birth and Life, Passion and Death of the Redeemer, in whom Jewish expectations are realized; His education of the disciples and His building up of His Church upon their faith, His

humanity and His mission, His moral teaching, and His great parabolic and prophetic utterances concerning the Kingdom of God and His righteousness; the subject-matter of the Fourth Gospel is not only the self-revelation of the Word-made-flesh, His unique relation to the Father, His sinless and attractive Personality, and His wonderful relation to men as their Light and Life, but also the many modes in which that self-revelation was received by men, the various ways in which it acted upon and influenced their lives and conduct, and the search-light it threw upon their characters, proving the truth of His own words, "For judgment am I come into the world." He is the central figure of the drama. Around Him surges and sways the conflict between belief and unbelief, discipleship and opposition, the varying issues and critical "hours" of which are set down with an impartial pen. Action and reaction, advance and recoil, disappointments and decisions, questions and answers, challenges and retorts—reveal both sides of the story of our Faith. If to some it was given to behold His glory, others went back and walked no more with Him. The sad judgment was to be recorded that light came into the world and men loved darkness rather than light. But in that Presence men are forced to a choice—a choice brief but yet endless. For neutrality is here a moral impossibility. Of such crises in the lives of many this Gospel is a record. Such a crisis is marked in the Apostle's memory by that "tenth hour." [1] Then it was that he obtained the first glimpse of eternal life, so that what is considered to be the greatest stumbling-block to modern critics was to this critic and believer the very altar stairs of his faith from which he beheld "angels ascending and descending upon the Son of man."

[1] John i. 39.

In this Gospel, the record of the experience of one who had lived in such an atmosphere, we have an historical, logical, and spiritual advance upon the positions of the Synoptists. But it is a natural advance. The truth which had been taught is now being realized. From moral discourses we pass to a revelation of the mysteries which lie at the root of moral life. The Personality of Christ, His Ego, is the centre of faith. Trust in such a Person, love for such a Person, the experience of life with such a Person, constitute the preparation for that higher and fuller revelation of His nature and His office and His mystical relations to the Father and His people. The writer does not attempt to analyze that Personality, which is His own secret, but to suggest its origin, the source of its power, the nature of its relation to God and man. It is through His Personality that the Christ speaks to us here, that He reveals Himself in touch with our humanity at every point. But it is no idealized Gospel. For the humanity of the Word, tangible, palpable, loving, suffering, working, is that which leads us to His Divinity, creating and ruling, judging and saving. For Philo the philosopher, existing in the clouds of abstract thought, the Personality of God and the Word might remain a matter of indifference. But for this Evangelist, living in the atmosphere of love and service, it was of the highest concern. The Father wills, works, draws, testifies, sanctifies, sends, saves, gives, and loves. He is "Holy Father," "Righteous Father," and is known and revealed and obeyed by the Son, who is One with Him; while the Son works, attracts, gives, judges, loves, ordains, and sends. To the Father the Son is a real Person, as the Father is to the Son. And the Holy Spirit is also a real Person, who convinces, leads, and reminds—personal acts. The Personality of God is not a problem for intellectual discussion, but

a fact for spiritual discernment. The writer does not define or analyze such personality. He does not argue for a self-distinguishing consciousness, a self-determining power, a self-sacrificing love, or a self-manifesting activity,[1] but the God he describes thinks and wills, loves and acts.

The fact that such a Divine Personality was spiritually, if not intellectually, understood in some degree by the writer, that it had been experienced, that its power had energized and fructified in his life, may be sufficient explanation for the immense development of the truth as it is in Christ in this Gospel as compared with the others. This is the original note of the Gospel which stamps it as the work of one mind. There was a vast difference between the enlightenment of those who heard the Sermon on the Mount, and that of those who listened to the sublime revelations of the discourses in the upper room and after ; as there was between the spiritual vision of those who heard those discourses, and that of him who composed this Gospel. The truth is only given as men are able to grasp it. The practical teaching of the kingdom of heaven in this life, and its final issues in eternity, already embodied in the Apocalypse, form the topic of the Synoptists ; while here we are introduced to the inner teaching of the relations of the Divine Persons of the Trinity to each other and the race of man, given by successive and progressive self-revelations of the Son of God who became the Son of man. But especially the spiritual relation of Christ to His people, that spiritual union which is the basal principle of true obedience and the fountain of the life in God which is eternal, is the thought that is here developed. The fundamental ideas are, however, intimately connected. The kingdom of heaven is alike the

[1] The four proofs of conscious personal existence are : " cogito, ergo sum," " volo, ergo sum," " amo, ergo sum," " ago, ergo sum."

summum bonum of the Sermon and of the conversation with Nicodemus, of which John may have been the only auditor. But while the former may be described as a republication of natural religion, the other is a revelation of spiritual life. Morality as depending on motive, goodness of conduct as gauged by purity of heart, the inner as the higher, the universality of the Father's love, the commandment of love—these are the principles of the Sermon. While of the Fourth Gospel the spiritual worship, the spiritual presence and self-sacrifice of both Father and Son, the need of the new spiritual truth which can only be realized by the "poor in spirit,"[1] are the ruling ideas. They mark a spiritual advance beyond those of the previous records and are not, as Renan said, "of an order entirely different from those of the other books of the New Testament." The Synoptic narrative, in fact, prepares us for such a development. It leads us to expect further disclosures, for it leaves us full of enquiries and speculations as to the nature of Christ, His Incarnation, His relation to His Father, and to us and His Kingdom. It has deposited the material which is worked out in the pages of St. John, where fact becomes sublimed into faith and deed is crystallized in dogma. But that material is not only the foundation but also the safeguard of "the teaching." For it has given the outline of the life of the Messiah of the Jews and the Saviour of men, into whose inner being and Personality and kingdom we are here brought by one who has personal knowledge of the Word of Life, and is enabled to interpret and expound that Word in His relations to God and man. It was left for the disciple whom Jesus loved, the man who had sounded the depths of His human heart, to sound the depths of His Divine Nature, to behold His glory, glory as of the Only-begotten from the Father, and

[1] Matt. v. 3.

to bear witness to His truth, thus combining the testimony of the senses with the evidence of the Spirit.

There is no earthly starting-point here. From the unfathomed depths of eternity, from the unthinkable recesses of the Divine Life is this beginning.

"From the great deep to the great deep he goes."

For there in the womb of Divine Existence lies the secret of the Lord's Divine nature and His Divine character. Having a full grasp of that Divine Personality, we shall find no incongruity in His signs and revelations. For if the Word becomes flesh, if the Son of God becomes man, *a priori* He will do things that no other man can do. And it would be a moral and logical impossibility for a supernatural life not to show like results. St. John has taught us, therefore, where to begin the career of the Word if we would understand His earthly life. He has given us the wealth of his own spiritual experience, and in his own clear phrase and thoughtful style, he has created the highest conception of the Christ.

Such a wonderful advance makes us hesitate somewhat before we can realize how a fisherman could have handled such deep religious problems with such apparent ease of language and thought. But there was no reason why a fisherman should not be as well versed in the Jewish traditions, Scriptures, and aspirations as a carpenter. Like every Jew, John had a trade. Nor was he an ordinary fisherman. He had a house in Jerusalem to which he took the Mother of Jesus, his father had hired servants, he was acquainted with the High Priest, and had liberty to pass in and out of his palace, although known to be a follower of Jesus. He had been trained by the Baptist, and he must have had singular gifts and graces of mind and soul—receptivity and self-effacement, insight and sympathy—to have won in such a marked degree the love of the

Master. After Pentecost his spiritual gifts became more largely developed, and the fisherman was transformed into a pillar of the Church and a witness of the Resurrection. And after years of preaching and expounding he might well compile such a Gospel, in which he repeated what he had learnt from Jesus, giving it back as it had filtered through his own soul and with a ring and colour all his own. Not learned in rabbinical lore, there is little in his Gospel to remind us of the Jewish schools. He differs from St. Paul as a man of genius would from a man of erudition.

V. Moreover, the writer must have been a Jew of the first century and a personal disciple of the Christ. His intimate acquaintance with the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish Church and the Levitical regulations of personal cleanness which fell into disuse after the destruction of the Temple;[1] with the festivals and localities of the Jewish Temple, and the politics of the Sanhedrin before its destruction; with the Messianic ideas of the Jewish people of the first century, with the geography of the Holy Land and the topography of Jerusalem, which is described with local colouring; with the court of the High Priest and its president; with the praetorium of Pilate; with the Aramaic names Golgotha, Gabbatha, Bethesda, the brook Kedron, Solomon's Porch; with the places where the Baptist worked, Bethabara and Aenon,[2] which are not mentioned by the Synoptists, and Ephraim and Sychar[3] in connexion with our Lord's mission; and with the Hebrew Scriptures,[4] prove that this Gospel was the work of one who lived in Palestine in the first century. Dr. Furrer, the geographer, in his examination of the topographical data of this Gospel, takes exception to one or two points only, namely, the name "Sea of

[1] Chwolson, *Das Letzte Passamahl*, p. 49. [2] iii. 23; i. 28.
[3] xi. 54; iv. 5. [4] xix. 37; vi. 45; xiii. 18.

Tiberias," for "Sea of Gennesaret," the former being the usual designation of the second century, and the latter of the first. But John's use of the name [1] implies the transition. Another point is that Bethsaida did not belong to Galilee, which ended with the right bank of Jordan.[2] But the writer describes a state of things and a Jewish atmosphere charged with petty jealousies of rival sects and paltry traditionalisms and political Messianic hopes, that belongs to A.D. 30, rather than to A.D. 90, and which could hardly have been accurately reproduced by the imagination of a man—no matter how gifted—who had even genuine traditions to work upon. Furthermore, the local colouring of such scenes as Jesus and the Samaritan woman is proof of an eye-witness. "The evidence," writes Canon Sanday, "that the author of the Gospel was a Jew and (as I think) also a Jew of Palestine is overwhelming." [3] We need not fear to apply Professor Ramsay's test of a genuine work to it. After describing the signs of a spurious document, he remarks, "But there is another class of documents whose spuriousness would cause a serious loss to the historian. *Such documents suggest a real story underlying the superficial facts;* the characters are living

[1] vi. 1.

[2] Sanday, *ibid.*, 114.

[3] *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 128–129. Canon Sanday also draws attention to von Soden's pamphlet questioning this local colouring, and to the fact that several points that occur in the Synoptists return in another form in this Gospel, *e.g.* it does not mention the healing of a demoniac, but Christ is charged with having a demon; it does not mention the Sadducees, but it describes the policy of Caiaphas and Annas, the princes of the Sadducees; it has no "elders," but "rulers" (*e.g.* iii. 1); it has no *lawyers*, but it has *rabbis* (iii. 2; vii. 15). He points out the essentially Jewish ideas of the connexion of sin with physical infirmity and speculations on this subject; the observance of the Sabbath; the claim of the Pharisees to be Moses' disciples; the expectancy of a Messianic King; the popular objection to Galilee as the birthplace of the Messiah, and the hope of the fulfilment of Deut. xviii. 18, "I will raise them up a prophet," etc. See John i. 46.

men, whose real experiences have caused the facts which appear on the surface, and from these facts we can work back to their past experiences, their surroundings, the world in which they moved." Such a document is the Fourth Gospel. The background of the picture is alive with living personalities, the very book itself throbs with the soul of the Hebraism of the first century. Again and again the writer brings us back to the facts of our Lord's life, facts which would be unknown to any but an eye-witness, and could not possibly have been imagined.

Furthermore, the work abounds in little touches of precision, casual remarks, and naïve comments and minute memories that only a friendly observer could make. Such observations as "it was the sixth hour," "it was night," "the servant's name was Malchus," "they had made a fire of coals, for it was cold," "there was much grass in the place," are, as Renan admitted, not to be explained on the supposition that our Gospel was nothing more than a theological thesis without historical value; while his precise notes of time—"it was the sixth hour," etc.—and accuracy of detail [1]—what Canon Sanday describes as "the pragmatism of the Gospel" [2]—are invaluable to any one who attempts to reconstruct the life of our Lord.

Furthermore, John is acquainted with the very thoughts and motives of Jesus,[3] and records the subjective impressions of the disciples—a class of remarks that stamp the eye-witness. In the twelfth chapter he relates what passed in the minds of the followers of Jesus at His Messianic entrance into Jerusalem. "These things understood not His disciples at the first, but when Jesus was glorified

[1] *e.g.* "The temple was forty and six years in building," etc.
[2] See *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, c. iv.
[3] ii. 24, 25; iv. 1; v. 6.

then remembered they that these things were written of Him." In the thirteenth chapter he describes the secret communications that passed between Peter and "one of the disciples whom Jesus loved." He alone depicts that pathetic scene when the Master committed to the disciple He loved the Mother who bore Him, and tells us that "from that hour that disciple took her to his own home." And on the Resurrection Morn, when Peter and "the other disciple whom Jesus loved" ran to the sepulchre, the writer simply tells us that Peter went in, but he describes what passed in the mind of that other disciple, who "saw and believed." There are many other incidents peculiar to this Gospel which bear upon its issue.[1]

In spite of his dislike for the "ideas" of this Gospel, Renan declared that "considered in itself, the narrative of the material circumstances of the life of our Lord, as furnished by the Fourth Evangelist, is superior in point of verisimilitude to the narrative of the other three Gospels." And in more recent years the critical school has more or less abandoned its previous position and theories, so that Professor Harnack could write, "There was a time when people thought themselves compelled to regard the oldest Christian literature, including the New Testament, as a tissue of frauds and forgeries. That time is past. The oldest literature of the Church is in the main lines and in most details,

[1] Among incidents peculiar to this Gospel are three miracles in Judaea: the healing of the infirm man, the giving of sight to the blind, and the raising of Lazarus; three miracles in Galilee, the turning of the water into wine, the feeding of the five thousand, and the miraculous draught of fishes; the purging of the Temple, the flight to Ephraim, the betrayal in the garden, the trial before Annas, Caiaphas, and Pilate, Joseph of Arimathaea's request, Pilate's gift of the body, the intercession of Nicodemus and his assistance at the Cross, three utterances from the Cross, three appearances of Jesus after His Resurrection, the walking on the sea, the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, and the anointing at Bethany.

when considered from the literary historical standpoint, true and authentic." This authority does not yet concede the Johannine authorship. But what other companion of Jesus could have written it? Who but John would fail to see a possible confusion arising from his simple description of the Baptist as John? Who but John could tell what was passing in his own mind? And in after-years John was called "the man who lay in the bosom." [1] From the many personal and local touches the inference is that the author was an eye-witness of the events and persons he describes; and from the manner in which the soul of the Christ and the inwardness of His Gospel of Light and Life are presented, the natural conclusion is that the author must have been especially qualified for his task by a closer intimacy with the Divine subject of his writings than was accorded to the other Evangelists. Such an intimacy, indeed, must have increased the difficulty of selecting and arranging the abundant material which lay to his hand,[2] for the presentation of Jesus he intended. The supposed supplementary character of the work is not, therefore, sufficient to explain the great gaps that have been pointed out in this Gospel, or why the author was content to give distant echoes and indirect indications of such weighty matters as the Temptation, the Mission in Galilee, the Lord's Prayer, the Holy Communion, the Sermon on the Mount, the Transfiguration, and the Agony in Gethsemane. It was a marvellous instance of restraint which the Evangelist, in fidelity to his great purpose, imposed upon his pen and his thoughts. He contented himself by revealing in a new setting and with an illuminative flash the heart and soul of such subjects as did not come directly within the scope of his purpose. For

[1] ὁ ἐπιστήθιος: so Polycrates of Ephesus (end of second century) in Eusebius, *H. E.*, v. 24, 2 ff.

[2] See xx. 30.

example, the references to the diabolic influence in Judas,[1] to the approach of "the prince of this world," [2] and to the judgment and expulsion of such an one,[3] throw a more intense and tragic light upon the spiritual life of the Master in that conflict with evil which reached its climax in Gethsemane than the Synoptic representation of the Temptation. The teachings of the Sermon on the Mount are summarized and reset in the discourses on prayer, love, peace, tribulation, and triumph in the fourteenth chapter; while the Lord's Prayer is set in a higher key in the seventeenth chapter, which, especially in verses 5, 6, 11, 12, 15, 20, 21, 26, is a spiritual commentary on the petitions, "Father, Hallowed be Thy Name," "Thy Kingdom come," "Deliver us from the evil." As the purpose of the writer embraces the interpretation and recognition as well as the revelation of Jesus as Christ and as Son of God, the discourse upon the spiritual feeding on Him in our hearts by faith,[4] fully compensates for the omission of the institution of the Feast of Love Divine, the required condition of receiving which being dramatically set forth in the Washing of Feet; and the Recognition scenes in the Garden, the Upper Room and by the Lake take the place of the Transfiguration and Ascension, to which, however, there are unquestionable references in i. 14 and vi. 62. And as the drama turns on the Master's conflict with the Messianic ideals and expectations of His day, the author is principally concerned with the Judaean mission, for the suitable presentation of which it would appear that he had special facilities, as it seems highly probable that on His journeys to Jerusalem,[5] our Lord was attended by only a few if, indeed, by more than one of His followers, and that the one who was best acquainted with the High

[1] vi. 7; xiii. 2. [2] xiv. 30. [3] xvi. 11; xii. 31.
[4] vi. [5] See vii. 10.

Priest and the Sanhedrin, the Temple and its rites, the city and its localities.

The mysterious indication of the Death and Resurrection, which was withheld by the Synoptists until the approach of the catastrophe, gives a pathetic intensity and tragic realism to the very beginnings of the Mission of the Christ. And, after all, why should not the writer have presented the words and deeds of the Master's life in that form in which it came most naturally to his mind to present it? He had evidently a genius for describing human character, for seizing the episodes in the life of his subject which were the turning-points in the tragedy of the Cross; and he had the insight to grasp the eternal, permanent, and spiritual elements in the teaching of Christ, and to present them in a language that was a suitable vehicle for dialogue, being light, graceful, dignified, and in some places reaching an elevation that is superior to anything in the Synoptists.

The presentation of Jesus that is thus obtained is more fresh but none the less real than the Synoptic. For if the treatment be dramatic, the cast is historic and the colouring local. The writer is all the time absorbed in his great theme. He is wonderfully impersonal. No word of criticism, favourable or unfavourable, escapes him. But although he loses himself in his work, it is to his subjectivity that we owe its excellence. Although his own emotions are suppressed by a marvellous self-restraint, we instinctively feel that he is there all the time, watching, waiting, pondering, no merely interested spectator or listener, but one who is absorbing every word and deed of the Master, nay, the very motions of His Spirit, in a heart that is most receptive to the Divine influence and inspiration, and in a soul that clings to His soul and loveth to reveal the Life and Light and Liberty he has found therein.

Personal references, comments, and coincidences and traits of character, such as his self-effacement, fit in with no Apostle's history and life better than with St. John's. Internal evidence, therefore, points strongly to him as the author of the Gospel.

The question whether the author was the son of Zebedee is affected by the statement of Papias, according to George the Sinner (*circ.* 840), and Philip of Sidé (*circ.* 500), in his second book, viz. that John and James were slain by the Jews.[1] Schwartz, in his monograph [2] on the subject, upholds this statement. The order in the extract from Philip of Sidé—" John and James his brother "—is contrary to the Gospel order, " James and John " —and even if Dean Bernard's suggestion [3] that in some manuscripts of Papias the Greek words for " His brother and James " were substituted for " the brother of the Lord, James " cannot be accepted owing to its order, this is sufficient to stamp the passage as an error. It is quite possible that Papias, whom Eusebius described as of " small intellect," may have misled Church historians on this subject, just as he misled Irenaeus on the subject of our Lord's age. See *Adv. Haer.*,[4] where that writer suggests on the authority of "all the presbyters who in Asia met John the disciple of the Lord, who lived with them until the times of Trajan," that the Lord had the " *aetas senior*, which is from forty to fifty years." I hope to prove from the literary connexions between the writer of this Gospel and St. Peter that it was John the companion of Peter who wrote this Gospel.

It cannot be seriously urged against his authorship of the Gospel that it was the work of one who was deeply imbued in Hellenic thought, for we have found it to be untouched by Greek speculation, and

[1] See De Boor's fragment, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 1888.
[2] *On the death of the Sons of Zebedee.*
[3] *Irish Church Quarterly*, Jan. 1908.
[4] ii. 22, 5.

to be as Hebrew in expression as the composition of one of the Master's own Apostles might be. That the writer should have employed the hackneyed phrase of another school in a sense so distinct and in so striking a manner, and that he should have reset the picturesque phrase in which the Synoptists had described the Transfiguration scene, of which he himself had been a witness, in his brief but pregnant reference to the Incarnation of his Lord, was only natural in the case of one who showed so much independence and originality of thought and purpose in the management and development of his theme. But this originality is of interpretation, not of creation. The character and personality and teaching of Jesus the Son of God were not invented by the Evangelist, and did not originate in his mind, but are shown in a new light. The historical nature of the Gospel, which has been so ruthlessly impugned by Professor Schmiedel in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*,[1] has strong internal evidence for its historicity in its portrait of the Christ. For in that it reflects so truly the environment of the Saviour's life, in that it reveals so utterly the soul of Jesus, in that it records so faithfully the various results of the self-revelation of the Son of man, in that it gives so unique a presentation of the Word, who is exalted above the clouds of humanity, and the mist of controversy, and who is yet so near to us in our joys and in our sorrows, in our separations and our reunions, its foundation cannot be fictitious. Its spiritual power to raise men's lives is an actual and undoubted fact, and is a testimony to the truth of the saying, "The Word became flesh and dwelt among us." For it is only the divinely true that stands the test of time. However, men may assail this temple of truth, it cannot be moved, for it is founded upon the Rock, who is its "fons et origo."

[1] Vol. ii. p. 2542.

In conclusion, we may say that by five different but converging lines of evidence, external and internal, history, style, and atmosphere, the case for the Gospel has been proved.

Note on xix. 35 and xx. 24 f.

Professor Wendt admits that the author of the "Source," as he styles the discourses, was an eye-witness, as he himself claims to be in his words of historic apprehension, "We *beheld* His glory"[1] and "Of His fulness we have all received,"[2] but maintains that the author of the narrative portion never claims to be an eye-witness. The passage referred to is John xix. 35, and contains the episode of the water and blood and the emphatic declaration, "He that saw it hath borne witness,[3] and his witness is true, and he[4] knoweth that he speaketh true things, that ye also may believe." Wendt remarks on this passage: "The Evangelist does not refer to his sight-seeing, but to another's whose credit and testimony he emphasizes. The passage is clearly a note, and the expression, 'He that saw it hath borne witness,' is quite distinct from 'We beheld His glory.'"[5] But it is equally possible that the writer may have referred to himself in the third person. Our Lord used this idiom in ix. 38, "Thou hast both seen Him, and He that talketh with you is He."[6] Zahn's view,[7] which Sanday accepts, is that "he" is the exalted Christ, who knows that His eye-witness saith true. Professor Jannaris[8] shows that ἐκεῖνος in the Fourth Gospel is used in the ordinary classical sense of "that great man,"[9] and follows Zahn in referring it to Christ, who is invoked as witness of the truth of His disciple's words. The note is, indeed, one which could have

[1] i. 14, ἐθεασάμεθα. [2] i. 16, ἐλάβομεν. [3] μεμαρτύρηκεν.
[4] ἐκεῖνος. [5] *Das Johannesevangelium*, p. 193. [6] ἐκεῖνος.
[7] *Introduction to the New Testament*, ii. 472, ff.
[8] *Expository Times*, July, 1903. [9] See vii. 11.

been written by one who like John had studied the art of self-effacement and would naturally shrink from pushing himself too closely upon his sacred subject. But even granting that this note may have been by another hand, it does not follow that the context is. We cannot conceive what means one man had of getting so far into another's self-consciousness as to record his subjective impressions. "Then went in *that other disciple* who came first to the tomb, and he saw and believed." [1] And the testimony of the footnote to the Gospel, "*This* is the disciple who testified of these things, and *we know* that his testimony is true," [2] goes to prove that the preceding Gospel was regarded in the days when the Gospels were being written [3] as the work of that disciple. Professor Jannaris rather weakens the case by suggesting that the Evangelist refers to himself in the third person, taking "This is" equivalent to "I am." The change from the plural "we know" [4] to "I think" [5] requires explanation. It is scarcely possible that the same writer, if at all careful, would speak now in the plural and now in the singular, unless we regard him as lapsing from an editorial comment [6] to a personal reflection: although we may compare the passing from the plural to the singular in "*We* beheld" [7] and "*He* that hath seen hath borne witness." [8] The note is not in the style of the Gospel at all and is distinctly the work of a later hand.

It seems unnecessary to refute Dr. Harnack's statement, that the verse was deliberately added with the intention of supporting the legend started by Papias that the Apostle John was the author

[1] John xx. 8. [2] xxi. 24, f.
[3] ἐὰν γράφηται. *Cf.* τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία, xxi. 25.
[4] οἴδαμεν. . [5] οἶμαι.
[6] Professor Jannaris suggests it is "the plural of modesty," *pluralis modestiae*, common in the speech of the Greek-Roman times.
[7] John i. 14. [8] John xix. 35.

of the Gospel.[1] For such a discreditable piece of work would, even in the eyes of the ancients, who were not so simple as wise moderns imagine and would speedily have detected the fraud, have discredited the Gospel. And were not Celsus and Cerinthus, Valentinus and Marcion, as keen as any modern professor? Has it been left to the nineteenth century to discover a fraud of the first?

It may be conceivable that the whole chapter (xxi.) might never have been written by the Apostle, but that its contents may have been reproduced from memory by the author of the concluding note, who may have, with many others, heard the thrilling story of Peter's restoration and the utterance of Jesus concerning "the other disciple whom Jesus loved" from that disciple's lips. After the death of that disciple and Peter, in accordance with the wishes of that disciple who seems, like Columbkille and Bede, to have been engaged at his literary labours up to the very hour of his departure, or with what seemed expedient to some of his pupils, he may have committed to writing that story as it was told by that disciple, and in that disciple's phrase, and added it as a supplementary chapter to the Fourth Gospel. And yet it is equally conceivable that the aged disciple, feeling death stealing upon him, might himself have added this appendix, which contains another of those invaluable notes of time, "This is now the third time that Jesus was manifested to the disciples," for which this Gospel is remarkable. Both Drummond and Sanday[2] accept this view. The former conception, however, would not present serious argument against the originality of the preceding portion, which seems to be a perfect piece. That the Gospel is like the Master's robe, "without seam, woven from the top throughout," will be established by a consideration of the principal partition theory in the next chapter.

[1] *Chronologie*, pp. 679, 680. [2] *Fourth Gospel*, p. 81.

CHAPTER III

THE PARTITION THEORY

THE defenders of the organic unity and integrity of this Gospel must naturally join issue with the advocates of the partition theories. Of these theories the most attractive is that recently put forward by Professor H. H. Wendt, in his book *Das Johannesevangelium.*

To state his argument briefly: The Gospel is not a perfect piece, like the seamless coat, but is a new edition, by a later mind, of the notes the Apostle had made of the discourses of Jesus. These notes, which the Professor calls *Die Quelle*—the Source—and places on the same footing as the older Synoptic tradition, were elaborated and set in an historical frame of post-Apostolic and later Synoptic tradition by a member of the Asiatic community, who worked in the first quarter of the second century. The Gospel is, therefore, the Gospel according to St. John in the sense that it contains the notes of that Apostle. It remains to be seen whether the view of the critic that the authority of the Gospel is in no way impaired, while its attractiveness is enhanced by this elaboration, can be maintained. The consideration of the arguments put forward for its composite nature and dual authorship will, at all events, help us to discover the really vital points in the lines of defence and to concentrate our forces upon these. Arguments

so plausibly put forward by the separatist force us to concentrate our forces upon the organic unity and structure of the Gospel, which will be based in the following pages upon the internal evidences of mind and art shown in the originality of the writer's standpoint and treatment of his subject, in the consistency of character drawing, and in the dramatic development of the narrative and the spiritual development of the revelation of Jesus. This order, as well as the chronology of the Gospel, another separatist, Dr. Briggs, would ascribe to the skilful editing of the redactor, but as both order and chronology are of the very framework and sinew of the Gospel, the existence of such an editor would be even more remarkable than the Johannine authorship of John i.–xx.

Dr. Wendt tests the Fourth Gospel by the Synoptic tradition as represented in the Gospel of St. Mark and the *Logia* of St. Matthew, and declares that the purification of the Temple, which St. John puts in the forefront of our Lord's mission, took place, as St. Mark has it, during His last visit to the holy city. "It is not probable," he writes, "that Jesus purged the Temple more than once. Only one such demonstrative act performed in righteous indignation would have inner justification." In St. Mark's Gospel it stands in a practical connexion with the development of the conflict which was to end in disaster; while, as it stands in St. John's Gospel, "it is a solitary deed, unrelated and without consequences." That it had significance in its setting, and that it had influence upon the subsequent attitude of Jesus to the Jews, is evident to the casual reader. The Lord's manner at the wedding in Cana was strange. The Mother who had gone to Him in a confiding way is almost repelled by His answer, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?

[1] *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scriptures.*

Mine hour is not yet come." That the approach of this "hour" is not to be merely the signal for the sign, is clear from the use of "hour" [1] in this Gospel to denote some momentous occurrence, some epoch in our Lord's history, *e.g.* "Father, save Me from this hour," [2] *i.e.* this period of stress and strain. While meditating a course of action that might open the eyes of the Jews, His train of thought was disturbed for a moment to be resumed after the help suggested had been rendered. No decisive deed followed immediately; but His restlessness may be read in the words, "And they continued there (in Capernaum) not many days." His soul filled with a mighty purpose, now that the consciousness of His mission and His origin had become awake, He follows the crowd of pilgrims to Jerusalem. Each annual visit to the city, since His twelfth year, had but served to increase His indignation against the wrong use to which the precincts of the Temple had been put. And now, specially reminded of His mission, He is prepared to display and assert in public the powers and the claims of which He had already given evidence in the private circle of His disciples. But He is repelled by the hostile attitude of the Jews, so different from the friendliness of the provincials. He is, therefore, thrown back upon Himself. An assumed aloofness conceals His feelings. He is experiencing the first pang of disappointment. And though He did many signs, and many believed on His name, He would not trust Himself to them, for He was beginning to learn [3] what was in man. Nicodemus, who had noted the signs and heard the words of the young preacher from Galilee, unable to break down that barrier of reserve in public, comes to Him privately, and learns from Him the inwardness of the spiritual change that admits to the kingdom of God. An

[1] ὥρα. [2] xii. 27. [3] ἐγίνωσκε.

alteration in His method of self-revelation: a more cautious manner, a calmer demeanour—these are the results of an episode which Professor Wendt regards as "unrelated and without consequences."

With regard to the publication and acknowledgment of His Messianic claims, there does not seem to be any real difference between the Johannine and Synoptic narratives. The great confession of Peter was not made for a long time afterwards at Caesarea Philippi,[1] and is duly recorded in John vi. 69: "We have believed and are sure that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." Here, at least, the Fourth Gospel falls into line with the Synoptists. Moreover, the growing reserve in the manner of Jesus which has been noticed in the Fourth Gospel is quite consistent with His rebuking and silencing the possessed in Mark i. 24, and His general shunning of publicity.[2] With regard to His own assertion of His claims, the Johannine account does not appear to be greatly at variance with the Synoptic. After the imprisonment of the Baptist, St. Mark tells us that Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God.[3] In the Johannine account of the Master's conversation with Nicodemus,[4] we find Him preaching of this kingdom of God, and only proceeding to give a fuller description of its nature and the conditions of admission to it, and of Him who was the centre, in response to the queries of the interviewer. It was only to those who were able to receive it, such as Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman, that Jesus revealed His nature and mission. From the multitudes who would make Him king He withdrew;[5] and by many of His disciples His claims were rejected.[6]

[1] Mark viii. 27; Matt. xv. 16.
[2] Mark i. 45.
[3] Mark i. 14.
[4] John iii.
[5] John v. 16.
[6] John vi. 66.

Wendt proceeds to examine a group of records concerning the Messiahship of Jesus. At the bottom of his exegesis lies, we think, a misapprehension of the relation of the Baptist to his great successor. In Chapter X an attempt will be made to prove that this Gospel contains the solution of the problem of the wavering of the Baptist. There at the outset his dream, the dream of his life, his vision and his testimony, are recorded. These things followed by an estrangement explain the disappointment that eventually may have led to a great despair.

In the meantime the Baptist continued his work; and Jesus withdrew again, when it was known that His disciples were more numerous than John's, lest He should wound the feelings of the latter. But the Baptist expressed himself in words of resignation.[1] Shortly after this, he is cast into prison; and from the soul of the caged prophet the vision he had received fades away. It had helped him to rise above all the Jewish aspirations of his time; but within his dark prison walls the golden hope passes from his grasp. He longs for another revelation, a fresh assurance to fan into flame the dying embers of his faith. This view shows that the wavering, so far from being "psychologically incomprehensible,"[2] is true to human nature. For they who rise to the highest heights of hope are prone to sink to lower depths than those who have never soared at all.

Again, it is noteworthy that in this Gospel, though it is essentially the Gospel of the Holy Spirit—a Gospel strange to the Ephesian followers of the Baptist[3]—nothing that could in the slightest manner detract from the character and work of the Baptist finds a place. Its writer paints the Baptist in a softer and more agreeable light, and

[1] John iii. 31.

[2] *Das Johannesevangelium*, p. 14.

[3] Acts xix. 4.

describes his relations to the Messiah as the constant witness of the True Light, not so much with a view to prove that the Messianic nature of his successor was known to John, as to re-establish the character of the predecessor.[1] There is also a strong similarity between the speeches which the Evangelist puts into the mouth of the Baptist and the Johannine discourses of Jesus. It may have been that the Evangelist reproduced the Baptist's statements, which are of considerable length and evidently summaries,[2] in the after-light of the revelation of the Word, and recast them in the form in which he reproduced the words of Jesus; or it may have been that the genius of the Baptist exercised a subtle influence upon the mind of the Apostle, and caused him almost unconsciously to adopt his manner of speech, as he recorded the Master's discourses. From the very beginning of the Prologue we see traces of the indelible impression made by the testimony of the Baptist upon the mind of the writer—a testimony which was daily receiving fresh confirmation in the Apostle's life, and which had induced him to make his venture of faith. It was owing to that ever-vivid impression that the author twice explains the course of the argument with which he begins his Gospel, by a reference to this testimony.[3] These passages, according to Wendt, interruptions of the original Prologue by the later Evangelist,[4] are thus, to another view, interludes of human music in the Divine Anthem of the Word, necessary links in that great chain of reasoning that is gradually lowered from the heights of existence and light, which no man can approach

[1] *Vide* John xi. 41.

[2] John i. 15–34; iii. 27–36.

[3] The μαρτυρία of the Baptist, to which Jesus appealed, interested the Fourth Evangelist, his *preaching* (described in various terms, εὐαγγελίζειν, κήρυσσειν, παρακαλεῖν, ἐλέγχειν) occupied the Synoptists.

[4] *Das Johan.*, p. 104.

unto or describe, to the levels of human being and thought, until the Word Illuminative and the Word Creative stands revealed as an historical figure upon the stage of life. In its broad lines this witness is consistently represented in the four Gospels; while its more special position in the economy of Christian revelation is given by him who, alone of the Evangelists, could gauge its value and estimate its influence and whose writings can hardly be said to be actuated by "a polemical interest against the Baptist." [1]

Having enumerated certain so-called differences between the Synoptic and the Johannine records, Wendt gives [2] a list of the many coincidences of words and groups of words that are to be found between these authorities, in points of trivial detail as well as in matters of the greatest moment. These coincidences, often quite undesigned, *e.g.* in the reports of the Baptist's words, the alabaster box, the scene with Malchus, the Denial, and the Passion, are to be explained, he says, by the previous acquaintance of the writer with the Synoptic tradition. A knowledge of the other Gospels is, indeed, presupposed by the writer of this Gospel; but this alleged use of the Synoptic records, now of one and now of another, without regard to the relative age and authority of the different sources, stamps the work as of secondary character in the eyes of Wendt. "For an independent witness would present a narrative similar in broad principles with previous records, but in particulars would take an original stand." [3] Now, the opposite position might be maintained with equal force. For an independent witness, while bound to adhere to the facts of the case, is at liberty to give his own impressions and interpretations of the principles at stake. And it is remarkable that the historical passages and narrative

[1] *Das Johannesevangelium*, p. 226. [2] pp. 30–44. [3] p. 44.

portions which Wendt attributes to an Asiatic writer of the first quarter of the second century, are generally regarded as containing the very points of evidence for the Palestinian authorship of this Gospel; while the history of the Judaean ministry stamps the work as independent.

But Wendt, while holding that the Evangelist availed himself of the labours of the Synoptists for the historical setting of his text,[1] allows that he found the most important portion of his material, the discourses of Jesus, in another written "source," and this of Apostolic authority.[2] The Gospel is, accordingly, of composite origin. The reasons for this hypothesis are these:[3] "In the first place, there are differences between the view-point of the Evangelist and the thought of the speeches reported by him, which could not possibly exist had the speeches been composed by the Evangelist." And in the second place, "the speeches partly belong to a different historical situation from that delineated by the Evangelist, and partly suffer interruption from the introduction of extraneous matter." In fact, the basis of Wendt's theory is the supposed difference of standpoint between the narrative and the rhetorical portions of the Gospel. In the historical part the "signs" are said to be extolled, while in the speeches "signs" are refused, but the appeal is to "works." This distinction, however, seems to be forced. For we find in the discourses a strange identification of σημεῖα (signs) and ἔργα (works), notably in the question of the Jews,[4] "What σημεῖον showest Thou, that we may see and believe? What dost Thou work?"[5] In the discourses, again, Jesus appeals to His "signs": "Ye seek Me not because ye saw the σημεῖα, but because ye did eat of the

[1] p. 46. [2] p. 53. [3] p. 50.
[4] vi. 30. [5] τί ἐργάζῃ.

loaves." [1] Here He rebukes the Jews for not having seen the significance of that work as a sign of Himself. But in the narrative portion,[2] omitted by Wendt, He does not appeal to His signs, but says, "Blessed are those who have not seen, and have believed." It is true that Jesus appeals to His ἔργα as a greater witness than that of John,[3] and that the Evangelist concludes the Gospel with a reference to σημεῖα "recorded that men may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." [4] But is this apparent difference a sufficiently strong basis for the theory that the latter passage was written from a different standpoint and with a different interest from the former? For the "works" of Jesus cannot be confined to His words, His preaching of the Kingdom, and His revelation of the Father; [5] nor can it be said that the "signs" are the ground of faith in Him.[6] In support of the former view, Wendt quotes iv. 34: "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His ἔργον"; and xvii. 4: "I have finished the ἔργον which Thou gavest Me to do." But this latter verse he connects with the words of the 6th verse: "I have manifested Thy Name," etc., whereas it stands in a closer connexion with the immediately preceding words: "I have glorified Thee on earth." Now, δόξα and its derivatives are used in this Gospel of objective manifestations. See i. 14: "We beheld His glory, glory [7] as of the Only-begotten, fresh from the Father's presence;" ii. 11: "This beginning of signs did Jesus, and manifested forth His glory;" [8] and xii. 27, where the words, "Father, glorify Thy Name," [9] are followed by a voice from heaven. The glory of the Father was not manifested

[1] vi. 26. [2] xx. 29. [3] v. 36.
[4] xx. 31. [5] p. 58. [6] p. 19.
[7] δόξαν. [8] δόξαν. [9] δόξασον.

simply by the word of preaching, but also by the word of power, for which see iv. 50: "And the man believed the word which Jesus had spoken."

It was the mission of Jesus to reveal the Father's love both by works and by words. His work cannot be limited to His word: nor may our interest find its centre in His word rather than in His Person. By the Prologue of the Gospel, the Divine Personality of Jesus is introduced to us before we find any allusion to His works, which were to the faithful observer sacraments of a Divine life among men, revelations of a Divine love in action, evidences of a Divine power at work, symbols of spiritual processes, and therefore σημεῖα, but which were to the Divine Worker Himself the natural outcome of His being, that which He wrought, the outer expression of His inner life, and therefore His ἔργα, His works. What were σημεῖα to others were ἔργα to Him. The difference is one of objective and subjective. This identification of ἔργα and σημεῖα may be further established by a consideration of the passages in which ἐργάζομαι (work) occurs. In v. 17–27, regarded by Wendt as part of the original source, Jesus says, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,"[1] etc.

The ἔργα referred to must imply something more than the work of preaching. They have a scale of greatness; they are the source of wonder; and they are connected in the 21st verse with the raising and quickening of the dead. Again, see xiv. 12: "He that believeth on Me, the ἔργα that I do shall he do also; and greater than these shall he do, because I go to My Father." It would narrow the scope of "works" unnaturally if one limited them here to the work of preaching. And in the narrative portion, ix. 1–4, where we should, according to Wendt, expect to find the word σημεῖα, we

[1] ἐργάζομαι.

have ἔργα: "Neither did this man sin nor his parents, but that the ἔργα of God might be made manifest in him. I must work the ἔργα of Him that sent Me while it is day." Now, if the word "signs" were not used in the discourses, and the word "works" never appeared in the narratives, Professor Wendt would have some ground for his contention. But we have seen that this is not the case, and that the miracles of Jesus are regarded as "signs" because manifestations of a higher nature than the human, and as "works" because the logical expression of that nature and "in rational sequence" with the Person who wrought them.

Furthermore, if faith in the Messiah is based on the "signs" of Jesus, and if the primary object of these signs had been the creation of faith in Jesus, that purpose cannot be said to have been successful. The "sign" in Cana of Galilee confirmed the faith of those who were already disciples. But the "sign" at Bethesda and the "sign" in the wilderness cannot be said to have created faith; while the blind man of the ninth chapter, whose sight was restored, did not profess faith in Jesus at first: he simply regarded Him as a prophet. Only after a personal interview was faith created.[1] Wendt builds upon the fact that the Schlusswort[2] only mentions the "signs" of Jesus; but there is good authority for the reading πιστεύητε, "that ye may go on believing," so that this passage, on which the new theory is built, may support the opposite view, that faith is represented in the narrative portions, not so much created as confirmed by the "signs." With this we may compare the somewhat doubtful conclusion of St. Mark's Gospel: "The Lord *working* with them, and confirming the word by *signs* that followed."[3] Accordingly, the whole

[1] ix. 35–38. [2] xx. 30, 31.
[3] συνεργοῦντος . . . βεβαιοῦντος διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων.

tenor of the narrative portion falls into line with that of the discourses, which is expressed in xiv. 11: "Believe Me that I am in the Father: or else believe Me for the very works' sake."[1] That is, if My personality, My life, and My revelation do not win your faith, then infer from the greatness of My works the greatness of My nature. Of the supernatural life described in the Prologue, the signs recorded in the Gospel are but passing episodes, fleeting flashes, the significant phenomena of a unique personality. The standpoint of the Fourth Gospel is distinct from the Synoptists' in nothing more than in this, that whereas in the latter the miracles are put forward as the credentials of His mission and the arguments for faith, in the former the primary motive of faith is the appeal He makes to our own hearts and consciences. The living Christ is thus the principal proof of His religion. As He signified His nature in His works, His works are the signs of His nature, stamping His utterances with the seal of Divinity and truth. And His Personality was manifested in and through His words and His works, His words being tokens of His Divine wisdom, and His works being proofs of His Divine power, so that in a wonderful manner word answers to work, and work corresponds with word, and yet without identification, in the economy of His Incarnate life.[2]

So far we cannot say that Wendt has established his position. His second argument is based on the relation of the narrative portion to the discourses.[3]

[1] τὰ ἔργα αὐτά.

[2] Sanday, *Criticism of he Fourth Gospel*, p. 23: "We remember, however, that the combination of 'signs' and 'wonders' occurs markedly in St. Paul (Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xvi. 12), and is, indeed, characteristic of early Christian literature long before the Fourth Gospel was written."

[3] Schmiedel well remarks, "There is much reason to fear that distrust of the authenticity of the substance often causes an interruption of the connexion to be imagined, where in reality

In the first place, he attempts to show that the author of the narrative failed to understand certain passages in the discourses. But as it would be quite consistent with the subordinate position and work of the Apostle in relation to His Master's utterances to fail in fully grasping their significance, we cannot attach much importance to the alleged instances of misunderstanding. We cannot say, for example, that it would be a higher or more correct interpretation of the words of Jesus, "Destroy this temple,[1] and I will raise it up in three days," to see in it a reference to the Jewish Temple and the reform of its religion rather than to the resurrection of His body. This was the turn the false witnesses gave His statement by adding χειροποίητον.[2] But read in the light of the Pauline expression, "Your body is a temple," [3] St. John's comment, "This spake He of the *temple* of His body," [4] is easily understood.

With regard to xii. 32, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Myself," Wendt declares it has a deeper significance than that given by the Evangelist, "Thus spake He, signifying by what death He should die." Jesus certainly does refer to an exaltation here, but, in His allusive style, refers to it in terms that are also applicable to the very mode of His death, which was a lifting above the earth. The Jews themselves saw through these words an allusion to removal from the earth, and they said, "We have heard from the Law that the Messiah abideth for ever: and how sayest Thou, The Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?" In his criticism of the Evangelist's well-known comment upon "rivers of living water," [5] Wendt presses the saying, "My words are spirit

there is none." He points out that many passages similar to those on which Wendt founded his theory are left by him untouched.

[1] ναόs. [2] Mark xiv. 58. [3] ναόs, 1 Cor. vi. 19.
[4] τοῦ ναοῦ. [5] vii. 38.

and are life," in order to identify the one gift with the other, and to show that as the gift of life was immediate, so was the gift of the Spirit, and that therefore both were the result of the preaching, not of the glorification, of Jesus.[1] The Evangelist, however, pointedly co-ordinates these gifts by repeating the verb. Finally, it is to be remarked that these notes with which Wendt quarrels are to be found in the discourses which he admits to be, generally speaking, of Apostolic origin, and therefore must have had high authority.

Wendt now proceeds to discover a lack of harmony between the discourses and their historical setting. He begins with c. v., and finds the speech v. 17 ff., has nothing to do with the narrative v. 1–16; for this reason, that in the setting of the discourse there is no allusion to any performances of any work by our Lord on the Sabbath day, inasmuch as the impotent man was cured by a word. This argument is of the nature of hair-splitting. For Jesus' action is referred to in the narrative as a work of beneficent activity,[2] through which in the eyes of the Jews, who regarded even sympathy with the sick on the Sabbath as a violation of its sanctity, He had not only made another break the Sabbath, but had broken it Himself. Again, Wendt regards the speech recorded in vii. 15–24, as a continuation of the fifth chapter. But the discourses have different subjects. That of c. v. concerns active goodness;[3] while in c. vii. the subject of discussion is moral teaching.[4] In v. 20, Jesus declares, "He will show Him greater works,[5] that ye may marvel."[6] In vii. 14, Jesus went up to the Temple, and began to teach, and the Jews began to marvel,[7] saying, "How knoweth this man letters, having never studied?" But the fact that words may cause surprise as well

[1] p. 64. [2] ποιήσας ὑγιῆ. [3] ποιῶ and ἐργάζομαι. [4] ἐδίδασκε, v. 15. [5] ἔργα. [6] θαυμάζητε. [7] ἐθαυμάζον.

as works does not prove that works are identical with words. The teaching of Jesus in c. vii. is moral doctrine concerning action. The Jews are inconsistent in their actions. They do not keep the Law of Moses, for they are thirsting for a man's blood. Here the Master refers to an episode in His life[1] which has drawn down upon Him the deadly opposition of the Jews. The infringement of the Sabbath law is excusable in a case of expediency; but the law concerning murder admits of no exception. As it stands, the discourse seems to belong to its setting. If, with Wendt, we place vii. 15–24 immediately after v. 47, we have an apparent link-word in "writings," *γράμματα*: "If you do not believe his writings, *γράμμασιν*";[2] "How knoweth this man letters, *γράμματα*?"[3] An obvious objection, however, is that v. 47 is clearly a peroration, and that the whole speech becomes a straggling discourse with two endings, very unlike the other discourses admitted by Wendt, if vii. 15–24 be read as its continuation. Moreover, *γράμματα* in the first passage is definite—the writings of Moses; and in the second is indefinite and general, and means education, viz. *διδαχή*, or doctrine. Admitting, however, the connexion between the two discourses, it is not unusual for a teacher to repeat himself and his arguments after a lapse of some months if he finds himself confronted with a similar set of circumstances.

We now come to chapter vi. Here it is related that the Jews, after having been miraculously fed by the loaves,[4] demanded a sign like that of Moses: "What sign showest Thou that we may see, and believe Thee?"

"How," demands Wendt,[5] "is such a complete ignoring of the miracle of the loaves conceivable?"

[1] v. 10. [2] v. 47. [3] vii. 15.
[4] 1–16. [5] p. 71.

But Jesus had already commented upon the fact that the Jews had sought Him, not because they saw the signs, but because they did eat of the loaves, and were filled.[1] As the narrative stands, it agrees with St. Mark,[2] who relates that even "the disciples understood not the matter of the loaves, for their hearts were hardened"; and after his account of the feeding of the four thousand, says, "The Pharisees came forth, asking from Him a sign from heaven."[3] Wendt discovers a link-word between v. 18 and vi. 41, in οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι. But it is not at all probable that the Jews of the fifth chapter and the Jews of the sixth were the same audience, for this reason, that, while the leading inhabitants of Jerusalem might have been generally aware of the Galilean origin and connexions of Jesus,[4] it is not at all likely that they were personally acquainted with Mary and Joseph, as these people were. This view is supported by St. Mark, in whose sixth chapter it is the countrymen of Jesus who ask this question.[5]

Another set of link-words, ἐργάζομαι,[6] ἔργα,[7] and ἐργάζεσθε,[8] are hardly able to bear the strain put upon them. For ἐργάζομαι is the middle of self-expression and ἐργάζεσθε of self-acquisition; while, according to Wendt's own interpretation, ἔργα consisted in the labours of preaching.[9] Furthermore, the subject-matter of the discourse in c. v. is utterly different from that of c. vi., the former being occupied with the evidence[10] for Christ, while the latter is concerned with the sustenance[11] that is to be found in Christ. Accordingly, if we follow Wendt's suggestion, and read both vi. 27 f. and vii. 15–24 with c. v, we have a grave confusion of subjects, Christian evidence, Christian sustenance, and Christian expediency

[1] vi. 26. [2] vi. 52. [3] viii. 11. [4] *Vide* vii. 27.
[5] vi. 3. [6] v. 17. [7] v. 20. [8] vi. 27.
[9] p. 74. [10] μαρτυρία. [11] ἡ βρῶσις.

following each other without connexion and without break. This order is hardly an improvement on that of the Gospel.

Again, we are told[1] that there is an artificial division between certain words in c. vii. and c. viii. The back references of the passage viii. 12–20 to the speeches in vii., if established, may prove that the discourses belong to the same period of time, the Feast of Tabernacles; but they do not establish any illogical separation. However, it is quite possible that the discussion whether Jesus was a prophet[2] is the proper introduction to His utterance, "I am the Light[3] of the world." Compare His reference to the Baptist, "He was the burning and the shining lamp: and ye were willing for a time to rejoice in his light."[4] After all, why should the Evangelist have cut up the original speech?

Wendt's suggestion[5] that there is another break of the same kind between verses 35–36 and verses 44–50 of c. xii. is advanced on the strength of the assumption that the scribe misunderstood verse 36, "He was concealed[6] from them," which, according to Wendt, means, "He Himself as the person indicated in the figure was hid from them." If so, what of the following word "departing"?[7] Is it another *Bildwort?*

The greatest alteration, perhaps, suggested by Wendt, is to read cc. xv. and xvi. after xiii. 35. The conclusion of c. xiv. bears the stamp, he says, of a last farewell. "Arise, let us go hence." Some colour is given to the suggestion by the fact that, in c. xvi. 5, Jesus says, "I am going to Him that sent Me, and none of you asketh Me, Whither goest Thou?" and in c. xiii. 36, Peter asks this very question. But is it possible to leap at a bound from c. xiii. 35 to c. xv.?

[1] p. 87. [2] vii. 52. [3] τὸ φῶς. [4] τῷ φωτί, v. 35.
[5] p. 90. [6] ἐκρύβη. [7] καὶ ἀπελθών.

We find that the whole conversation of cc. xiv. and xv. follows from the words of Jesus to the eleven, xiii. 31–35, the two leading thoughts of which are His departure and His new commandment. C. xvi. is an answer to questions arising out of His going, its place and purpose, and its consolation. The little band then leaves the room; and the Master on the way returns to the other subject of His thoughts, love.[1] The love of the disciples is then contrasted with the hatred of the world.[2] His followers remain silent with awe; and to recall their thoughts from their future distress to His present purpose, He says, "Now I am going to Him that sent Me, and none of you asketh Me, Whither goest Thou? But because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your heart";[3] and then proceeds to state more fully the reasons of His going, and of the advent of the Comforter; and declares more plainly then ever, "I came forth from the Father, and I came into the world. Again, I leave the world, and I go unto the Father."[4] Then the disciples say, "Now Thou talkest openly and speakest no proverb. Now we know that Thou knowest all things, and needest not that any should question Thee." Would it not be startling after this confession that He has answered all that is in their heart to find in xiii. 36–xiv. 31 (which Wendt places after c. xvi.) the disciples asking a number of questions the answers of which are presupposed in the fuller teaching of cc. xv. and xvi.? Furthermore, the concluding words of the Master, "In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world," which come in so appropriately where they now stand before the prayer of self-consecration to which they give the key-note, present a climax from which the thought, if it but issued in a series of

[1] ἀγάπη. [2] xv. 18. [3] xvi. 5. [4] xvi. 28.

questions, would suffer an unnatural and inartistic descent. Accordingly, if the discourse would suffer by such a replacement of its parts, such a replacement leads to a real displacement, unless there are stronger reasons than Wendt has yet adduced.

In the remaining portion of this work, Wendt proceeds to analyze the Gospel into its constituent parts according to the principles he has already laid down, and to describe the characteristics of the " Source," [1] and to state his reasons for holding that it was the work of John the Apostle. It is much that this is admitted by German criticism. But it seems that a less pronounced effort to explain away the supernatural element would lead men to the same conclusion concerning the whole texture of the Gospel, which cannot be divided without being destroyed. For that it is " without seam, woven from the top throughout," has been established by nothing so much as by this attempt to rend it.

In conclusion, while we join issue with Dr. Wendt's criticism of the narrative portion of the Gospel, and his theory of the dual authorship which creates greater problems than it solves, we have nothing but gratitude for his study of the discourses of Jesus, for the light he has thrown upon their connexion and meaning, for his defence of their apostolic authorship, and for his vindication of the words " which are spirit and are life."

[1] The "Source," he says (p. 189), represents a record uniform with the Synoptic tradition, full of the spirit of the historical Jesus, and free from marks of an unhistorical nature.

CHAPTER IV

THE ORGANIC UNITY OF THE GOSPEL

GERMAN criticism has thrown a new light upon the study of the Gospels. And even while we reject Strauss' view of the promulgation of an idea by a collection of myths, or Baur's theory of a literary outcome of a theological controversy, or Wendt's dual hypothesis—the efforts of these scholars to obtain a complete view, to read the purpose of the writers and to trace the genesis and development of the Evangelical records—their work is helpful to the student because it assists him to look at the subject from the opponent's point of view. The Germans, however, began with the two assumptions, that miracles were an impossibility, and that no one who knew Jesus could have regarded Him as Divine. Their result was therefore a foregone conclusion. For they had either to eliminate all that asserted the one and substantiated the other, or to explain the records as compositions designedly elaborated in the interests of a given idea. A different method of study would be to approach these documents without any presuppositions whatever, and to apply to them the same historical and literary canons of exegesis which would be employed in the case of classical literature. This method would be fairer to the writers and their work, and would not be hampered by having to find facts to support given hypotheses. For if Jesus was *a priori* merely man, if miracles are *a*

priori impossible, then the speeches of the Gospel before us were concoctions and the "signs" inventions, and consequently the Gospel itself was the result of a fraud, pious or impious. But if we find that the Gospel was written with a noble purpose in view, we can hardly believe that such would be served by such a compilation. For faith in such a person as Jesus could hardly be secured by a process of deception, and therefore such a process would hardly be likely to commend itself to those who sought to establish that faith. And if we also find that these alleged fictions are set in a framework of historical facts, that they are the manifest records of an eye-witness, who had assimilated them in his soul and reproduced them in the after-glow of memory, with an impalpable air of candour, in evidence of his Lord's Divinity, we must regard them, at least, as the composition of honest faith.

Each of the Gospels was written with more or less of a "tendency." St. Matthew wrote his Gospel to show that Jesus was the Messiah of the Jews; St. Mark took for his theme the strong Son of God; St. Luke was guided in the selection of his materials by the grand thought of a universal Saviour. But St. John wrote his spiritual Gospel with another purpose, which dominates his work from beginning to end. It is found in the concluding sentence,[1] "These things are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." The Gospel is the record of the revelation of a Divine life among men. The material is disposed in a masterly way to express this idea, and is selected to convey this thought. The words and works of Jesus are such as would come from the Word-become-flesh, being supremely spiritual in their significance and distinctly universal in their application. From the opening statement of belief,

[1] xx. 31.

"In the beginning was the Word," to the concluding confession of faith, "My Lord and my God," the theological design of the Gospel is so manifest that it might be called the Gospel of Evidences, or the Book of Signs. It is significant that the miracles of Jesus are not described in this Gospel as portents or awe-inspiring deeds, but, as we have already seen, as "signs"[1] and "works."[2] They are called "signs" because they are evidences of a higher order than the natural, because they were manifestations of a greater nature than the human, because they were proofs of a Divine power at work among men, and because they were revelations of a Divine Love, a Divine mind, and a Divine Personality. They are called "works" because they were the logical expression of His character, His person, and His mission, or, as Athanasius puts it well, because they were in "rational sequence with that person and that mission"; "works" because they were "efforts directed to an end,"—an ordinary definition of work —and that end the manifestation of His glory; and "works" because the phenomena proper to Him as the Word, the Son of God. In a word, as He manifested His nature and His person, in his works, even so His works are the signs of that nature and person, stamping His utterances with the seal of Divinity and truth. In the first instance, our Lord appeals to His person, and in the last instance to His works: "Believe that I am in the Father and the Father in Me, or else believe Me for the very work's sake."[3] But that person was manifested in and by and through His works and His words. His works were meant to be proofs of the Divine power, and His words were intended to be tokens of the Divine wisdom of the Only-begotten of the Father. And in a marvellous way word answers to work and work corresponds with word.

[1] σημεῖα. [2] ἔργα. [3] John xiv. 11.

The doctrine of the Bread of Life is anticipated by the miracle of the loaves and fishes, in which the Saviour proved Himself, indeed, to be the Sustainer of men. That remarkable utterance, "I am the Light of the world," is to be taken in connexion with the restoration of sight to him that was born blind. While the words, "I am the Resurrection and the Life," immediately precede and predict the raising of Lazarus from the tomb.

Furthermore, in the light of the Gospel's opening words, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was in relation to God, and the Word was God," every work has an eternal significance and every word an infinite import. It has been urged against the authenticity of this Gospel that it records none of those wonderful parables that form so interesting a feature of the Synoptic Evangels. But we are here standing on a higher summit than the Mount of Beatitudes, even upon the serene levels of the Divine existence that slope gently down to the low-lying marshes of human thought. From this position of vantage and point of vision every action of Jesus is an expression of His Divine person, a parable of eternal relations. The changing of the water into wine, the restoration of sight to the blind, the healing of the courtier's son and of the cripple in the Bethesda, the feeding of the five thousand, and the raising of Lazarus are all signs, illustrations of the various activities for good that issue from the Word of Life to transform and illumine, to sustain and restore, to heal and renew the weak and the fallen, the decrepit and the degraded children of men; while the purging of the Temple and the washing of the disciples' feet are actions that represent two great and eternal processes—the purification of a national worship and the cleansing of the individual soul by Him who baptizes with fire and with the Holy Ghost. Every word, too, is

carefully chosen, and the scenes are specially grouped to convey one grand theological idea, the manifestation of the Son of God who became the Son of man to make the sons of men sons of God. All the consummate grace and literary finish of the writer is spent on his glorious theme, not with the view to varnish a tale, but to display the truth.

It has been remarked that while there is less of the ideal and imaginative element in this Gospel, while there are fewer graphic pictures and vivid scenes in its pages, there are more natural and life-like or matter-of-fact touches than in the others. In the record of the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves, we read that the loaves are barley loaves, and that there was much grass in the place. These are the observations of an eye-witness, and as such are of evidential value. In the record of the restoration of the courtier's son, St. John is very careful to point out that the courtier took a note of the time when Jesus said, "Thy son liveth," and on his return home questioned the servants on this point and found that the boy began to recover at the very hour—"the seventh"—in which Jesus gave him that assurance, and himself believed and his whole house. This is a point of evidence on which the legal mind would seize.

We are also informed that His works are spontaneous in character, not the outcome of compassion or request so much as the independent manifestations of glory wrought with the purpose of inspiring faith. The Saviour brooks no interference and receives no suggestion, not even from His own mother, saying kindly but firmly, "Woman, what is there between Me and thee? Mine hour is not yet come." The courtier who ventured to ask Him to "come down"[1] receives the mild rebuke, "Go thy way,[2] thy son liveth." To the poor

[1] κατάβηθι. [2] πορεύου.

cripple in the Bethesda, the Lord Himself offered health, "Dost thou wish to be made whole?" Before He asked Philip, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?" He had already determined in His own mind what He would do; "for He Himself knew what He would do." When His disciples asked Him concerning the man that was born blind, "Master, who did sin, this man or his parents that he was born blind?" Jesus answered, "It is not because of this man's sin nor that of his parents, that he was born blind, but it was that the works of God might be made manifest in him." And when they announced to Him the illness of Lazarus, "Lord, he whom Thou lovest is sick," He replied, "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified." And then He said some days after, "Lazarus is dead, and I am glad for your sakes, in view of your faith, that I was not there." Jesus is the master of circumstances and controlled by none; His very thought is action, and His action is as immediate as His intention. Thought is action with Deity and existence is the activity of the Divine reason, as Aristotle declared centuries before the Evangelist represented the passing of the Saviour's thought into beneficent activity, a process too instantaneous to be photographed in pictures of space and time; for its seat was a Divine mind and its source a Divine will. This point of the Master's autonomy is also of evidential value, bearing testimony to the organic wholeness of the record. Does not this activity of the thought of the Word receive an illustration from modern science which points to the conclusion that matter may, after all, be but pure force arranged in various combinations and in various proportions? And does not the idealistic interpretation of the universe, advocated by Mr. Balfour, in his presidential address to the

British Association, throw light upon the significance of the passage, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God"?

Moreover, the interviews and conversations are specially selected and marshalled in order to introduce the reader to different aspects and forms of belief and unbelief, and, recording the conflict of light with darkness, with all its varying issues and bewildering results, successes, and failures, are also of the greatest value as evidence. For if they introduce us to the quickly convinced mind of Nathanael, they also depict the tardily won faith of Thomas; if they describe the boldness and recklessness of the Samaritan woman's venture of faith, "Come, see a man who told me everything that I did: is not this the Christ?" they also portray that wary but wistful searcher after truth, Nicodemus, and the unnamed disciple's belief in the Resurrection.

Faith, in hardly a single instance, is reached at a single bound. The faith of the disciples is progressive, and in some cases its development is arrested. There is the energetic and unreasoning faith of Peter, the man of action and feeling who hardly pauses to think; there is the cautious and calculating faith of Philip, a reserved man, who seems always thinking. There is the determined hostility of Judas, and there is the deliberate agnosticism of Thomas; there is the cold-blooded suggestion of Caiaphas, and the cruel taunt of the brethren of Jesus; there is the brutal examination by Annas, and the patient inquiry of Pilate. And the Gospel which began with the contrast of light and darkness concludes with the contrast of Jesus and Barabbas, the Just Man and the robber. These contrasts add to the aesthetic character of the Gospel, even while they give it

somewhat artificial colouring; for they help us to realize the actual effects of the revelation of the Word on the lives of men, and the personal influence of that gracious Personality as it moved in contact with the world. The life of Jesus is represented as a struggle to the death between holiness and worldliness, humility and pride, self-sacrificing love and self-seeking ambition. And in this struggle the vision of the Christ in the midst gleams upon the eye of faith with an ever-increasing lustre, as "the Way, the Truth, and the Life." For that Life, in the pages of St. John, is gradually revealed in conflict with the wrong ideas and the false ways and unreal lives of men, and so was beautifully and divinely adapted to test the faith of the true disciple and the patriotism of the true Jew. For here was One who seemed to the superficial onlooker to ignore the Sabbath and to speak blasphemy. But to a true observer it was not in the spirit of crushing conceit, stinging sarcasm, or overwhelming egotism, but with a Divine purpose that He dispensed health and happiness on every day without distinction; and those words which men called blasphemy were not uttered in tones of lofty arrogance, but in the full assurance of His relation to His Father and of His own Divine mission. The revelation Jesus gave of Himself was, accordingly, a test of faith, a test of man's fairness in weighing evidence, a test of man's anxiety to know and do the truth, a test of man's yearning for a new life, and a test of man's capacity to follow in the way of holiness. For as He gradually made Himself manifest to His disciples and the world, the inner and the outer circle of His social life, as "the Way, the Truth, and the Life," He threw a search-light upon the hearts of men that disclosed their characters and their intentions in His presence, causing them to fall more or less into two groups. Growing faith, destined to conquer, is revealed in

conflict with hardening unbelief, doomed to succumb. This contrast, actual, natural, and historic, between faith and doubt, the genius of the Apostle was inspired to seize upon and empowered to depict in all its changing lights and shades with a realism which adds to the effect of the Gospel without detracting from its truth.

With regard to these discourses, we have noticed that Jesus occasionally speaks in the same mystical way in the Synoptic records. But we remark that these discourses, which have found a new and powerful advocate in Wendt, but which Renan had the bad taste to call "pompous tirades, dull, badly written, and making but little appeal to the moral senses," serve the main purpose of the writer. For they display the perfect wisdom of the Word, not growing, not in a stage of development, but final and complete. The writer soars grandly above the mists of the petty controversies that embitter the tone of the Pauline Epistles. He rises supremely above the narrow spirit of the Hebrew religion and the purely moral theology of the Greeks. And to him Jesus speaks in the language of Divine relations, "I and My Father are one," and "That they may be one, even as We are one; I in them and they in Me." This Gospel, at least, cannot be regarded solely as a development of Jewish prophecy and apocalyptic. There is no mere focussing of national or existing ideas in this Messiah. "He is a Prophet," as the once blind man and the woman of Samaria declare. But He is more than a prophet; He is the spokesman of God; He declares the Father; He reveals His love: He is therefore the Word of God—Philo's term, but not in Philo's sense—who was in the beginning with God.

He is a Priest, but more than a priest. For as the high priest of humanity, He prays for the consecration of all believers in a unity of spirit and love,

in a perfected state of joy and glory and vision that is the outcome of His own self-consecration. What Old Testament prophet ever prayed, "Father, glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son may glorify Thee"? It was the Son of God, who became the Son of man, that so prayed. Again, He is a King, but more; for He has "authority over all flesh." A King, indeed, to whom Pilate points us, "Behold your King"; but a King of a Kingdom from the vision of which time has already effaced all that is transient and mundane, leaving only that which is permanent and spiritual and true. "My Kingdom is not from hence," He said to Pilate. Thus it is that the expression "Kingdom of God," or "Kingdom of Heaven" only occurs in the account of the interview of Nicodemus, whose hope was fixed on the Messianic Kingdom, and was designedly employed there to correct a Jew's imperfect conception. For to have a vision of that Kingdom, one must be born from above, and to enjoy its life there must be the spiritual birth of which water is but a sign. The King of the Fourth Gospel has life in Himself; His domain is the spirit and His gift is spiritual, even eternal life. Such discourses as these may make but little appeal to the moral senses: but they appeal to faith—that spiritual insight into things unseen—for they stimulate its venture and they expand its vision.

Furthermore, the speakers are not introduced solely as pegs on which discourses may be conveniently hung, like the characters in the dialogues of Plato, who act as foils to the wisdom of Socrates. Nicodemus does not come forward merely to give our Lord the occasion of enunciating His doctrine of spiritual regeneration. The woman of Samaria is not brought upon the stage to start our Saviour on His teaching of spiritual worship. The Greeks, indeed, gave our Lord the opportunity of laying

down the Christian principle that self-sacrifice alone is fruitful, but their coming on the scene is prophetic of the gathering of the kings of the Gentiles to greet Him who has, as Messiah, entered into His own city. Their entrance marks the expansion of the Gospel and its power beyond the limits of Judaism, and has every appearance of having actually taken place. There is nothing apocryphal, therefore, although there is much that is artistic, in the manner in which the various types of faith and doubt are represented by the writer of the Fourth Gospel. The work is an entire piece. As Canon Scott Holland says,[1] "Its solidarity and integrity, as the product of a single mind and temper, as the expression of a distinct and deliberate purpose, is becoming, as it seems to me, more and more convincing. It is like nothing else in the whole wide world of things. It is unique in its tone, in its assumption of authority, in its freedom of touch, in its peculiar form of expression, in its special imaginative atmosphere." We can read it through at a sitting, while we are carried along by an ever-increasing interest in its ever-growing revelation and ever-deepening spirituality, until we come to that grandest confession of recorded faith, the grandest because uttered after the greatest struggle with doubt—"My Lord and my God." Here the work originally ended: but it seems that something required to be added. The Apostle had portrayed the Word as He revealed Himself to the world. But he has not yet described Him as He worked in His Society. Nor has he yet recorded the recovery and restoration of his comrade Peter to the Apostolate. A false impression, too, about his own death must be corrected, and accordingly a codicil is added to his testament by his own hand, or by the hands of those who looked up to him as master, and

[1] *The Problem of the Fourth Gospel.*

who but committed to writing the oral teaching of their bishop. And this appendix, though singularly out of keeping with the universal range and spiritual vision of the Gospel, which is for all men and all time, shows the Apostle pausing in his lofty flight to swoop like an eagle from the clouds of mystical contemplation upon details of apparently limited interest and temporary import—an artist unfettered by his art.

For John, the miracles of Jesus are sacraments of a Divine presence. The Church militant is already gathered out of many waters to the shores of eternal life. His gaze is ever fixed on things behind the veil, his vision is one of Divine purpose, increasing through the ages; his communings are ever with the Word, and his attitude is that of one who waits and listens for the coming of his Lord.

Such is the superb art, and such is the sublime purpose of this Gospel, which stamp it as a single piece, the work of a single mind. Such a unity, organic as regards thought and style, has, we have seen, been recently called in question by Professor Wendt, and others whose dual hypothesis of its composition receives an indirect refutation from the considerations put forward in this chapter.

CHAPTER V

THE CHARACTER DRAWING OF THE GOSPEL

CONSISTENT character drawing is an aesthetic mark of the organic unity of the Fourth Gospel. The characters are subtly but distinctly drawn, and are placed in situations where the lights fall upon the shadows, and the evil is the foil of the good. The directness of the author's style helps him to preserve the individuality of his personages. Even in the report of the Baptist's speeches the *oratio directa* is employed. The speakers are introduced without connecting particles, little variation being shown in the use of the conjunction *καί*; and instead of the ordinary Synoptic idiom, "Jesus answering, said," the writer has a more impressive phrase,[1] "Jesus answered and said." The striking, manner in which the conversations are thus introduced serves to print them more indelibly upon the mind, and renders it easy to remember what Jesus said and what the Jews answered, what Nicodemus remarked and what Jesus replied. The Jews, who are so frequently in controversy with Jesus, are familiar personages, instinct with life. A remarkable use of this formula is found in ii. 18, where the Jewish officials are introduced with vividness by the words, "Then answered the Jews and said unto Him." As yet there has been no mention of opposition. But the effect of this simple turn is to fill the background with a crowd of hostile figures,

[1] A more literal rendering of the Hebrew phrase, see Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 25. *Cf.* Mark vii. 28.

who do not accept the action of Jesus with submission, but proceed to challenge Him, and by their retort, which from their point of view was final and overwhelming, show that they do not accept His answer. The style of the author thus assisted him in giving prominence and sharpness to the characters he outlines.

Furthermore, the object of the writer, which was, generally speaking, to record the development of faith in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, required that he should describe the influence of his Master and His doctrine upon individuals, and thus he was led to give more attention to character drawing than the Synoptists. This effect was gained largely by the play of thoughts in the dialogues and by the words of Christ that—

> ". . . half reveal
> And half conceal the soul within."

Jesus is the central figure of the drama,[1] which is superior to all other dramas in its reality and pathos. Around Him surges the battle of faith and doubt. From Him a light falls upon the souls of those who are brought into His presence, and upon all with whom He has to do. The character of Jesus is thrown into clearer relief by the characters of His immediate followers which are graphically and almost artlessly painted. It is John who sketched the Apostles as we love to think of them. Andrew is vividly drawn in a few strokes of the artist's pencil. Practical and full of suggestions, he is as ready as his brother Peter to take the initiative, but is less impulsive. Andrew is the first of the two disciples of the Baptist who left him to make a recruit. "He first findeth his brother Simon."[2] He is the first to call attention to the "boy here with five barley

[1] *Expositor*, Sept. 1907, *Dramatic Development of the Fourth Gospel*, by the present writer.

[2] John i. 42.

loaves and two small fishes," adding, " but what are these among so many ? " [1] He takes the lead in introducing the Greek strangers who had applied in the first instance to Philip. St. John's portrait of him shows him worthy of the prominent position which he occupies in the Synoptic Gospels as one of the first four,[2] but there he is merely a lay figure. Here he has life. Philip is another disciple rescued from obscurity by the reminiscences of one who must have known him in his youth. He is attached to Andrew, his fellow-townsman, upon whom he leans, and through whose masterful influence he may have been induced to obey the call, " Follow Me." He believes in the experimental proof. In answer to the question of Nathanael, to whom he confides the discovery he and his friends have made, he answers, " Come and see." [3] When interrogated by the Master, who wished to prove him, " Whence shall we buy loaves that these may eat ? " he *calculates*, " Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not *sufficient* for them [4] that each of them may take a little." [5] He also *calculates* precisely the revelation required to support their faith—" Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us." [6] Jesus rebukes him tenderly for his not recognizing His character, " Have I been so long time with you,[7] and yet hast thou not recognized [8] Me ? " It is to Philip, the Greek-speaking disciple with the Greek name, that the Greeks applied for an interview with Jesus. Another lay figure of the Synoptists has " warmth and colour " in the Fourth Gospel. Nathanael, the contemplative Israelite " in whom is no guile," seems to move and speak before us. His reply to Philip, " Out of Nazareth can any good come ? "

[1] vi. 9.

[2] Peter and Andrew, James and John (Matt. and Luke); Peter and James and John and Andrew (Mark iii. 16 ff.).

[3] John i. 48. [4] ἀρκοῦσι. [5] vi. 7.

[6] ἀρκεῖ, xiv. 8. [7] ὑμῶν. [8] ἔγνωκας.

is involuntary rather than listless. He is a young man who *sees visions*, and he arises at Philip's word, "Come and *see*." To the Master's observation he replies, "Whence knowest Thou me?" "Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I *saw* thee," is the answer which possibly touched some spiritual crisis or vision—which may have been shaped by meditation upon the words of the Baptist regarding the Paschal Lamb and the dream of Jacob, the Israel in whom was guile—of the man's soul. "Rabbi," he cries, "Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel." The man's heart is revealed in a flash with all its despair and aspiration, for he too is a Galilean of Cana, as we learn from c. xxi. 2, longing doubtless for some movement to come from his own country to regenerate the social life of Jerusalem, with which each Passover brought him into connexion, but sadly mindful of the social restrictions and prophetical disabilities of the northern people. And he passes from his dream to the reality. "Verily, verily, I say unto you,[1] ye shall see[2] the heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man," is the Master's comment for the group in general, but in particular for Nathanael, for whom are the words, "Thou shalt see[3] greater things than these." Bartholomew, who has hitherto figured only in Apostolic lists, appears in flesh and blood in the Fourth Gospel as Nathanael the mystic, the seer of visions. The Simon Peter of the Fourth Gospel is the very same Peter of the Synoptists, sturdy of figure and character, rash in action, but quick to repent. His great heart is full of love, but his soul lacks discipline. He is drawn from the life. We almost see his gestures of expostulation in the scene of the Washing of Feet.

[1] ὑμῖν. [2] ὄψεσθε. [3] ὄψει.

Peter—"Lord, dost *Thou* wash my feet?"

Jesus—"What I am doing thou dost not yet understand,[1] but thou shalt see[2] afterwards."

Peter—"Thou shalt never wash my feet."

Jesus—"If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me."

Peter—"Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head."

It was the same impetuosity that provoked the stern words of reproof, "Get thee behind me, Satan."[3] It is Peter who burns to know who the traitor may be. He alone has the courage to ask Jesus where He is going,[4] just as he ventured to take and rebuke Him in Mark viii. 33. It was Peter who answered in the name of the twelve, "Lord, to whom shall we go *from* Thee? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we hold it as our belief and experience that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,"[6] just as it was Peter who answered and said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God";[7] and who, with others, followed Jesus into the desert place and said, "All men seek Thee."[8] It was Peter who drew the sword in the garden and denied the Saviour in the court. It was to Peter and the other disciple whom Jesus loved that Mary Magdalene brought the alarming tidings of the disappearance of the body of Jesus. Both ran to the sepulchre. Peter was left behind in the race, but he was the first to enter the tomb and see the linen clothes lying on the ground. In the Epilogue, it is Peter who says to the others, "I go a fishing,"[9] and who threw on his upper garment,

[1] οἶδας.

[2] γνώσῃ. St. Peter used both verbs in the same distinctive senses of "understanding" and "seeing" in John xxi. 17, in answer to the Master's question.

[3] Mark v. 33. [4] John xiv. 34. [5] ἀπελευσόμεθα.

[6] John vi. 68, πεπιστεύκαμεν καί ἐγνώκαμεν. [7] Matt. xvi. 16.

[8] Mark i. 37. [9] John xxi. 3.

and cast himself into the sea and swam to land—a far more natural action than that recorded in St. Matthew xiv. 29, where he assayed to walk on the water. And in that pathetic scene on the beach, it is the naïve naturalness of Peter's character that gives it truth and reality. His heart is probed to its depths. He now feels more intensely than ever the degradation of that night of confusion, terror, and denial. "Lord," he replies the third time—but omitting the twice-repeated word of self-confidence, "Yea," [1] and appealing to the omniscience of the Shepherd who feeds His sheep, who is also the Master who knows their hearts—[2] "Thou hast absolute knowledge [3] of all things, Thou *seest* [4] the love in my heart." There is a subtle art in the use and order of these terms which had been employed by the Master in His answer to Peter.[5] Nothing in the Synoptists at all approaches this scene in human interest, pathos, or vividness; and nothing in Scripture is so remote from inventiveness, for its *raison d'être* lies in the recorded history of the man. The natural disposition of Simon is even more strikingly described in its rebound from penitence to curiosity. Unable to concentrate himself for any time upon his own affairs, he remarks the disciple following, and the question instantly shoots through his brain and speeds forth from the doors of his lips, "Lord, what of this man?" And he is rebuked, but not so severely as in Matthew xvi. 23. Accordingly, we owe to the Fourth Gospel a more natural and human representation, and one more psychologically true, of the man of rock, than that of the Synoptists, who notice him far more than the others, but who do not evince the same living interest for him as one who writes of him as one would of a life-long companion.

[1] *ναί.* [2] Acts i. 24, *καρδιαγνώστης.* [3] *οἶδας.*
[4] *γινώσκεις.* [5] John xii. 7, *οὐκ οἶδας . . γνώσῃ δέ.*

Another disciple, whose character is sketched in the barest outline, stands out distinctly from the crowd. His name is not revealed. The writer keeps his identity, as well as his own, a secret. But the process of elimination renders conjecture possible. Two of the Baptist's followers are standing with him when Jesus passes by. They follow the stranger. Of these Andrew is one, and the other makes one of the Synoptic group of Peter, James, and John. At the Supper, "the disciple whom Jesus loved" was reclining in His bosom, and to him Peter beckoned, and he says, "Lord, who is it?" Only once again does he open his lips in public to say, "It is the Lord." By light, personal touches, however, his presence is felt in every scene, particularly in the interviews with Nicodemus and the woman of Samaria. Another disciple accompanied Peter to the high priest's house. He was known to the high priest. The door-keeper admitted him, knowing him to be a disciple, and Peter on his introduction, saying to the latter, "Art thou *also* of this man's disciples?" [1] He is the only disciple of Jesus present at the trial before Annas, recorded only in this Gospel. "The disciple whom Jesus loved" stands by His Cross, supporting the Virgin Mother, and receives her as a sacred trust. It was to "the disciple whom Jesus loved," as well as to Peter, who was standing with him, that Mary Magdalene brought her strange tidings. He outran Peter, doubtless being a much younger man, and came first to the sepulchre, and bending his head, looked in and saw the linen clothes lying there, and the napkin that had been on His head, not lying with the clothes, but rolled up apart in another place—details accurately noted by one who saw their evidential value—but he waited until Peter came up and entered, then he went in, and saw and *believed*,[2]

[1] John xviii. 17. [2] xx. 8.

—a subjective impression which no third party could describe. In the Epilogue, the two sons of Zebedee are present. But it is the keen eye and insight of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" that tells him whose voice they hear, and he informs Peter. As Jesus paces up and down the shore with Peter, his companion, "the disciple whom Jesus loved," follows at some distance, not liking to be far from his Master, and yet loth to break in upon a confidential discourse—a delicacy supremely peculiar to the Fourth Gospel, and in keeping with the tact and reserve of the author. And of him Jesus said, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou Me (as he doth)." The saying that that disciple should not die, evidently blurted out by the irrepressible Peter, receives immediate correction by the writer. The constant proximity of the disciple to Jesus, the solemn legacy made to him at the Cross, and the fact that he possessed more than others the confidence and love of the Master, stamp him as one of the leaders of the band. He shrinks from publicity, but does not dread it when devotion requires, as at the trial. He knows when to speak and when to be silent. He accepts the legacy in silence, for the moment is too solemn for speech. But he ventured to break the silence when others feared to ask the question that was on the lips of all. It was not fear, but the same sense of delicacy observed above, doubtless touched with awe, that made him hesitate to tread the ground where the Master had lain. But when Peter rushed in, he followed, and sawand *believed*,—a remark which implies a previous condition of hesitation, if not of doubt. This disciple evinces a love and devotion to the Master not less than Peter, nay, which appear greater because his is a more disciplined andchastened spirit. He makes fewer mistakes, because he has the grace of self-effacement, which is also conspicuous

in the writer of the Gospel. The delicate tact and touch of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" in this Gospel, are also peculiarly the Evangelist's who showed a nice reserve in his avoidance of the details of the Conception, which presented no obstacle to St. Matthew and St. Luke, while he manages to convey in the most subtle manner to his readers, by the Prologue, that the pre-existence of the Word, who "became flesh and tabernacled among us," obviated the necessity of a human father, for whom there is, indeed, no place in this Gospel. Again, why was the Evangelist interested in suppressing the prominence and concealing the identity of the beloved disciple, unless it was that he wished to withdraw him the more from our view that our gaze might be more wholly fixed upon the Master, upon whom his own soul was entirely concentrated? But this was a personal, subjective reason, for he took no pains to suppress the identity of Peter, nay, he alone describes the restoration of the fallen disciple, which is merely implied by Luke xxiv. 34 and Mark xvi. 7. It is for this reason that the two last verses of the Gospel seem an addition by a later hand.

The character of Thomas, agnostic but impulsive, is written in one line—"Let us go, that we may die with Him."[1] "Lord," he exclaims in the upper room, "we know not whither Thou goest, and how can we know the way?"[2] In the test scene of the twenty-first chapter, the capacity for belief that lies in the honest doubter is revealed, and he makes the grandest confession of faith in the Gospel—"My Lord and *my God*."[3] He had grown to see God manifested in the flesh. The difficulty of the Resurrection for him is overcome, and he makes an even greater venture of faith than the others. There is thus a personal charm in the drawing of

[1] John xi. 16. [2] xiv. 5. [3] xx. 28.

Thomas, of whom Matthew, although his companion in the Apostolic band, and Mark are strangely silent. Matthew, perhaps, owing to the previous calling, had little intercourse with the leaders of the Apostolic company. We can picture him to ourselves, taking notes of the *Logia* of the Master, but listening and living somewhat apart from the others, and being little concerned with their sayings and doings. Whereas the writer of the Fourth Gospel describes the disciples he rescues from obscurity as one who knew them intimately, and was deeply interested in their movements and utterances. And these disciples are all Galileans, as we may assume from xxi. 2. Who could have found such interest in this band of young Galileans but one of themselves ?

The influence of Jesus on a wider circle required the drawing of the Baptist, Nicodemus, the Samaritan woman, the blind beggar, Lazarus and his sisters, and Mary Magdalene. The scenes in which they are introduced are full of interest, life and charm. The depths of their souls are probed. The thoughts of their hearts are disclosed. The secret inspiration of the Baptist's life-work is laid bare in one brief word—" He who sent me to baptize, the same said unto me, ' Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on Him, that is He who baptizeth in the Holy Spirit.' " [1] A single sentence [2] reveals the soul of Caiaphas, callous and calculating. The word " it is expedient " [3] already employed by the Master,[4] when it meant self-sacrifice, here spells self-love. A blow exposes the hollowness of the trial before Annas and the baseness of his character. The *dramatis personae* are not lay figures. They move and act, they think and talk before us. Instinct with life and individuality, their characters

[1] i. 33. *Expositor*, Nov. 1907, *The Baptist and the Fourth Gospel*, by the present writer.
[2] xviii. 14. [3] *σύμφερει*. [4] xi. 50; xvi. 7.

are consistently and dramatically expressed as by a keen observer of men.

The Saviour, the principal figure in the tragedy, is depicted in keeping with His nature. His words have a simple majesty that stamps them as appropriate. The incidents that are selected are such as might take place in connexion with a Being of so lofty a character and so complex a nature. The character drawing is both natural and delicate. The portrait grows under a master's hand, the expression rapidly develops under his graphic strokes, until the Man stands before us, a Man without a peer. The artist, like the great painter who only worked in four colours, attained the most sublime effects by the simplest methods. This combination of sustained elevation and natural directness is peculiarly Hellenic,[1] and contributes largely to the success of the work. The writer's literary gift had been moulded and matured by a long contact with Greek life and expression, in the very same way as St. John's would have grown in the Greek cities of his episcopate. The attitude of the writer is not altogether that of Antigone—" My sympathy was aye with love, not hate." To a large extent he sought for points of reconciliation, for elements that made for peace in philosophy and life, but he made war, like the Boanerges, upon forces he regarded as contrary and opposite, which in relation to Christ. are occasionally termed " the world." [2] His Gospel is not an eirenicon, much less an apologia, but it is the record of a faith which was his light and life. The story of the composition of the Gospel is in keeping with its style and subject-matter. But whether written or not by the Apostle at the request of his people and in answer to the challenge of his

[1] Professor Jebb, *Classical Greek Poetry* (Macmillan), p. 198.

[2] This word is found in the sense of " humanity " in John xii. 16, etc.

foes, "the spiritual Gospel" shows the after-glow of faith, the ripeness of the experience of one who knows, of one who—

> "Patient stated much of the Lord's life
> Forgotten or misdelivered, and let it work,
> Since much that at the first in deed and word
> Lay simply and sufficiently exposed
> Had grown (*or else my soul was grown o match,*
> Fed through such years, familiar with such light,
> Guarded and guided still to see and speak),
> Of new significance and fresh result.
> What first were guessed as points I now knew stars,
> And named them in the Gospel I have writ."

Believing, as we do, that the Evangelist was "the disciple whom Jesus loved," his task was a superhuman one. His case is different from the other Evangelists. His standpoint is higher and other. He had to describe the Master for whom he cherished a deep and undying affection, without emotion. Here again we notice his marvellous gift of self-effacement. He is here distinctly impersonal. As he stands there at gaze upon that Life and Death, which is not a past fact, but a present reality, he loses himself in the contemplation of his sacred subject, it disparts, dispreads—

> "As though a star should open out all sides."

It becomes his world.

Transcendently Divine, supernaturally good, Jesus is represented in his pages as the Exemplar of humanity, the Son of man, because the circumstances and conditions of His life were in all things such as ours, save in the matter of sin. Although the Word of God made flesh, He is in touch with us at every point. All along the line of humanity that gracious form moves and loves, guides and saves. The very virtues that belong to our race, trust and reverence, patience and gratitude, obedience, submission and sacrifice, are His. Here we pause again to notice the skill of the writer. Although his is

the record of an experience gained by contact with the Incarnate Logos of God, and his picture, painted in reverent strokes, is of a Divine Personality, full of grace and truth, still, minute touches, impalpable etchings remind us of the humanity of the Divine Person at every turn, and recall us from the cloudland of theology to the practical problems of life. The Personality of Christ the Word towers supremely above us, sublime and unapproachable, and yet He is the Lamb of God who hath borne our sorrows and carried our sins. The pre-existence of the Word, and the sinlessness of Christ are emphasized in the stately sentences, " In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was in relation to God, and the Word was God," and in the memorable challenge, " Which of you convicteth Me of Sin ? " But the sympathy of Jesus, His delicate treatment of the Baptist, His weariness, His tears, the groanings of His spirit, His indignation, His decision of purpose, His preference for certain persons (" Now Jesus loved Martha and Mary and Lazarus "), His thrice repeated appeal to Peter, with its subtle variations of ἀγαπᾷς and φιλεῖς which that disciple was not slow to feel, His commandment of love, His revelation of the Father's love, His inmost emotions, too sacred almost to approach, are made known to us, now with a reverent reserve and then with an unreserved reverence, by one who here lifts us to the heights of the Christ life and there discloses the depths of the Christ heart. There is power in conception, pathos in expression. The writer's inspiration is not wonder, or grandeur, but love exerting its power, faith conquering, as who should say—

> " I see the whole design,
> I who saw power see now love perfect too."

Here is nothing meretricious or ambitious, such as we would expect in the work of one who was not

an eye-witness of the Life he describes, but much that is profound and mystical, much that seems prolix because it is too deep and vast for comprehension, but naught is here too great or too grand. Much there is that is Divine, much also that is human. And as it is the Divine that raises, it is the humanity that reaches us—

> " 'Tis the weakness in strength that I cry for;
> my flesh that I seek
> In the Godhead."

The Saviour is a living, loving and beloved Personality to the writer, and He appeals throughout to His Ego, His Personality, His Character. " Believe Me that I am in the Father, or else believe Me for the very works' sake." [1]

In the discourses of the Upper Room, which appear to soar far above the horizon of human thought, the Saviour's soul is revealed to us. His very thoughts are illuminated and analyzed as by one who could understand him better than others. But it is not as the Messiah or the Son of David that He is here depicted. The writer strikes a universal note. The Kingdom here is the Kingdom of Truth. The Gospel is for the world. The Saviour is the Son of man. The writer's sense of the sublime helps him to understand the universal and catholic tendency of the Master's words and works. " That power," which Longinus tells us, " some said was born with us and was not to be learned by precept, but was only attained by one art, nature," was surely his. But not untutored in this case was this native power. For it was properly governed and altogether bent in the direction of his mighty thought—" the acknowledgment of God in Christ." But if the writer's sense of the sublime is marvellous, his delicate power of discrimination is remarkable. The combination of both was well calculated to

[1] xiv. 13.

keep the subject within the bounds of human life and yet above the commonplace. Such was the writer's genius. His work is, therefore, more effective in its strong simplicity than if set off with all the graces of the poet and arts of the rhetorician. "For even in tragedy," saith Longinus, "it is not permissible to swell immediately, much less suitable must it be therefore to do so in works founded on fact." [1] Some such canon of taste was followed by the Evangelist. For there is in this Gospel no ill-timed emotion, no attempt to work upon the feelings, no passionate declamation, no attempt at effect. But in the setting forth of the Master's words, which are often as tender as they are sublime, in the description of the Master's deeds, which are wrought as much in pity as in power, there lies a pathos that might touch all hearts and fill all men with an impassioned love for—

> "that Face
> How beautiful, if Sorrow had not made
> Sorrow more beautiful than Beauty's self."

for that Form that "bent Him to the sorrows of His time," who leaneth over the fallen sons of men, the Lamb of God who beareth the sin of mankind, the Saviour of men, who, like the Shepherd of the Synoptists,[2] goeth forth to seek the lost.

Furthermore, the writer's motive is personal. He desires to bring his readers into close and living touch with his Master's Personality. He did not know Him by way of notional apprehension, but in a real way. Therefore he sought to lead others to a real apprehension, a firm grasp of, and faith in, the Master, like his own. He did not define the Master's nature. He did not reduce Him to an abstract entity, or attenuate Him into an æon, or convert Him into a category. Nor did he purpose merely to bring Him before us as the Synoptists

[1] *De Subl.* iii.

[2] Matt. xviii. 12; Luke xv. 3.

did, as He lived and walked and wrought. But while giving us as much of the outward circumstances of that sublime Life as was necessary to his plan, he endeavoured especially to help men to understand the soul of His individuality and the individuality of His soul. It is the heart and mind and will of the Saviour that he strove to reveal, even as the Saviour revealed the heart and mind and will of the Father. And this he desires to do because he, too, yearns over the children of men, because, like the writer of the Apocalypse, he, too, is our "brother and companion in affliction and in the Kingdom and patience of Jesus,"[1] because we are also his "beloved," his "little children," and he longs that we may have communion with him, for his communion is with the Father and with His Son, Jesus Christ, and that so our joy may be fulfilled.[2] "These things are written," he says in his Gospel, "that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, ye may have life in His Name."[3] "These things have I written unto you," he says in his First Epistle, "that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the Name of the Son of God."[4] His solicitude for us is no less than his zeal for his Master, and he would have us share in his knowledge and love of that Master, and have the peace of forgiveness and eternal life. He seems to say—

> "Then stand before that fact, that Life and Death.
> Stand there at gaze, till it dispart, dispread,
> As though a star should open out all sides,
> Grow the world on you as it is my world."

He apprehends naught else but the Living Christ, and he would have us say with him—"We have heard, we have seen with our eyes, we have looked upon, and we have handled the Word of Life."[5]

[1] Rev. i. 9. [2] 1 John i. 3–4. [3] John xx. 31.
[4] 1 John v. 13. [5] 1 John i. 1.

CHAPTER VI

THE DRAMATIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE GOSPEL

THE dramatic progress of the Fourth Gospel is a testimony to the frequently challenged organic unity of the work. In his description of the Master's action and passion the writer's art is no less conspicuous than in the manner in which he has set forth the growth of His teaching. As in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the masterpiece of Attic tragedy, superb delineation of character is here united with the highest constructive skill. In his presentation of the drama of the "Word-made-flesh" the art of the writer secured that the climax should be approached by scenes of rising interest; a development of plot, character and purpose; a process which arises naturally out of the conditions of the tragedy itself, depends not upon artificial intervention, and culminates at the supreme moment in a surprising reversal of fortune; a περιπέτεια which in this Gospel is the choice—"Not this Man, but Barabbas."

Although occupied with the sublime discourses and the glory-glimpses of the Word, the Evangelist does not lose sight of the lower elements of time and place on which its value as history depends. For its historical relation to the other Gospels, as supplement, is obvious and mutual. The writer stops the gaps that occur in the Synoptic narrative, at the same time marshalling his facts and incidents so that they should bear directly or indirectly upon the central issue and illuminate the central figure. But he relates the events that happened immediately after the Temptation, the call of the disciples, the return to Galilee, the marriage in Cana, the stay at Capernaum, the visit to Jerusalem during the

Passover, and the ministry of Jesus in Judæa while John was baptizing in Aenon, not so much with the view to fill up the hiatus in the Synoptic records as to explain the Judæan situation and the spiritual environment of Jesus, and so to prepare his readers from the outset for that combination of circumstances which bore the Saviour onward to His Cross. The return to Galilee in c. iv. 43–54 is the same as that noticed in Mark,[1] "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came to Galilee;" but is mentioned by the Apostle, "because Jesus Himself testified that a prophet hath no honour in his own country," and therefore it has a significant connexion with the climax. The reception given by the Galileans is an effective contrast with the indifference of the Jews, and the sign in Cana which awakened faith is a foil to the sign in the Temple which aroused opposition. The miracle of the five thousand is followed by an account of that discourse in the synagogue of Capernaum which succeeded and interpreted it, because it was the cause of the falling away of many of His disciples,[2] and so gave occasion to the Master to make that affecting appeal to His disciples—"Will ye also go away?" which He followed up with that solemn declaration that throws a shadow over the whole story, and causes us to look for elements of treason, the material for tragedy, in His own circle. "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?"[3] This saying was not related by John to show that he was aware of the selection of the twelve, but because of its inherent importance in the development of the drama, and is therefore of great value as a point of independent and unconscious coincidence.

The writer records the Lord's missions to Jerusalem not merely because they are omitted by the Synoptists, but because they indicate the

[1] i. 14. [2] John vi. 66. [3] vi. 70.

development of the drama of the Saviour's life. To those visits the words of impassioned eloquence recorded by St. Matthew allude, "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often did I wish to gather thy children to Me, as the mother bird gathers her chickens under her wings, but ye did not wish!" [1] The period of six months that intervened between the events described in the sixth chapter and the seventh is not indicated by the words, "Now the Jews' feast of the Passover was nigh," in order to give a corrected chronology of our Lord's life, but in order to prepare us for a further development of the Jewish hatred and sinister designs. "For He was not willing to walk in Judæa, because the Jews sought to kill Him." And yet the Synoptists' record of the Galilean ministry fits in here. The withdrawal of Jesus into Peræa, the place where John used to baptize at first,[2] is not intended by the writer to throw an additional light upon Matthew xix. 1, "And it came to pass, when Jesus finished these sayings, He withdrew from Galilee and came into the coasts of Judæa beyond Jordan," although it does do so, but to indicate that new scene of missionary activity which was to be the vantage ground from which the Saviour made His last attempt to win the holy city.

The resurrection of Lazarus, a distinct episode in this Gospel, is fully related because of its important bearing upon the events that followed. For a report of this miracle led to the calling of the Sanhedrin, the political utterance of Caiaphas which became prophetic, and the determination of the chief priests to kill Jesus,[3] and Lazarus with Him,[4] "for many of the Jews went away because of him, and believed in Jesus." But there are naturally many cross references to the Synoptic record which are invaluable to the harmonist. For example,

[1] Matt. xxiii. 37. [2] John xi. 40–42. [3] xi. 53. [4] xvii. 10.

Bethany, "the village of Mary and her sister Martha," refers us back to Luke x. 38–39. The Epilogue of the Gospel records several events, the fishing in Galilee, and the repentant Peter's commission, in order to indicate the lines of further development, but indirectly it confirms the statement of St. Matthew's Gospel, "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee into the mountain, where Jesus had appointed them," [1] and it interprets the draught of fishes of St. Luke v. by another that is to supersede it.

The plan of the writer is, therefore, historical, if his object is doctrinal. His dogmas are facts, and his facts become dogmas. He approaches his subject from the side of experience, from what he has seen and what he knows and believes. As the revelation of the Son was historical and progressive, the effect of that revelation is also historical and progressive. As there were many steps in His self-revelation, so there were many steps in men's belief concerning Him. His Divinity was not revealed at once, nor was it directly accepted. The development of faith is punctuated by certain crises called hours, the stages in the battle of faith and doubt. These "hours" are peculiar to the Gospel, which exhibits that conflict with singular dramatic intensity. They are a striking feature of the Gospel. The dramatic genius of the writer seized on certain points in the life of Jesus which mark the development of the tragedy in which He is the chief actor, certain well-defined periods of time which mark the advancing stages of His work and sacrifice, certain landmarks which indicate the steady advance of His great purpose to lay down His life for the world, until it reaches its final catastrophe on the Cross. The one supreme event to which His life moved forward was not attained at one rush, but by a series of

[1] xxviii. 16.

onward movements, each of which carried Him further than the last, that are to be attributed as much to a Divine plan as to the course of human passions. These epochs are powerfully used by the writer, who knew, as every student of humanity knows, that the lives of the greatest men naturally fall into distinct epochs, junctures, crises, tragedies.

"Hour" [1] in the Fourth Gospel is, therefore, to be distinguished from "time." [2] The former is dependent on the will of God—the ruling principle of the Saviour's life as love was His ruling passion—while the latter signifies opportuneness with regard to human affairs; a contrast which again meets us in the distinction between "therefore" [3] or natural sequence and "in order that" [4] or Divine purpose. "Hour" in this Gospel accordingly means a special point of development or transition in the Divine plan, a well-marked stage in the progress of the Divine Life on earth full of interest and influence for humanity, a psychological moment in the evolution of the Messianic consciousness full of significance for the Saviour's purpose—the salvation of the race and the accomplishment of the Father's will, the will Divine which is so permanently before His mind, and which has been so well described by Dante as—

"The sea to which creation moves."

To specialize, "Mine hour is not yet come" [5] means something more than "It were too soon for Me to begin My work." It signifies that "the special time appointed for Me by My Father, in which I am to reveal the Father and Myself to mankind, has not yet come. That critical juncture in My life when I must surrender My home ties, when I must foreswear all the attachments of My humanity, when I must manifest My Divine power,

[1] ὥρα. [2] καιρός. [3] οὖν. [4] ἵνα. [5] ii. 4.

has not yet arrived. I am waiting the Father's sign." That "hour" was a memorable one in the Saviour's life as the Son of man and the chosen One of God. And it came soon afterwards in the purification of the Temple during the Passover of the Jews. Thus the crisis in the life of the national Deliverer coincided with the commemoration of that historic crisis in the national life when the people were led by Jehovah out of darkness into light.

But there is an even more telling and powerful use of this expression "hour" in the seventh and eighth chapters, viz. "They sought to take Him; but no man laid hands on Him, because His *hour* was not yet come." In these chapters we notice the growing hostility, the gathering opposition of the Jews to the teaching of Jesus. They were now beginning to see the drift of His revelation. His claim to be a heaven-sent Teacher they bitterly resented. And from their point of view they had reason. For were they not the upholders of the orthodox and traditional teaching of Judaism, which this Galilean *parvenu* sought to uproot and destroy? There were many steps in our Lord's self-revelation. He revealed Himself as the expected Messiah to His own disciples and they acknowledged that claim, but He often hinted that He was something more. On this occasion, when He declared His Messiahship to the world openly in the Temple, and proclaimed that, although without the credentials of any Jewish school, He had a mission from God, the leaders of the people were so exasperated that they would have taken Him, but "no man laid hands on Him," for His hour was not come. The picture is in vivid but pathetic light. We see the keen anxiety written on the brows of the Apostles as they stand around their Lord—the only calm and self-possessed One in the crowd. We read the fierce indignation and wrath on the countenances

of the priests and elders, in their hands lifted up to strike, in their uncertain and excited movements. But the murderous hands are divinely held back. The Master is mysteriously delivered. Matters are hastening to a crisis. The hour which commemorated a crisis in the national history of Israel, the Feast of Tabernacles, was to mark the development of a crisis in the Messiah's life. But the crisis has not yet come. There is another cup of sorrows to drink, another crown of sorrows to wear. The malice of Christ's foes has not yet triumphed over the manifest goodness of His life and doctrine which appeals to so many of their number. For the hand of God is there, above all things, supernaturally directing all events to their proper issues by His outstretched arm, until the time is ripe and the circle of the Saviour's life is complete. With the postponement of the supreme event our suspense is renewed. But the postponement leads to greater revelation, advancing stages in His action and passion, His doing and suffering.

Artistic beyond words, but not in the least artificial, is the manner in which the Apostle seized upon that marvellous hesitation of the Jews to arrest the Man they so desired to arrest, and sketches it in graphic lines so that we can almost see the plot as it progresses and the conflict as it develops.

Another well-marked "hour" in the Master's life is the visit of the Greeks. Recognizing the significance of the request and coming to these strangers, He said, "The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified." But the next moment His mood passes into one of great trouble, as He contemplates the terrible nature of the conflict that awaits Him before the conquest can be won. Whether flashed upon His consciousness in a moment or gradually revealed by the Divine process, the truth has been brought home to His soul that He is the

seed-corn that is to be dissolved in the ground, and from which a new principle of spiritual life is to go forth to regenerate mankind. And His inward struggle betrays itself in that broken sentence, "What shall I say? Father, save Me from this hour. But for this cause came I unto this hour." It was not death itself, but all that lay before it, and the weighty consequences that were involved in that awful *agon* with sin and all its powers that troubled Him. In comparison with such issues the terrible humiliation and suspense of the death He was to die were a small matter. It was the dark shadow that lay before His death and made Him for a moment feel unequal to the task and cry out in tones of indecision, "What must I say?" But in His hour of distress His trust came to His aid. "Father," he cries, "bring Me safely out of this hour." He prays not for release from it, but that He may be brought safely through it and out of it. Therefore He adds, "And yet on this account came I unto this hour." And the thought of the Father's glory, even in His own shame, buoyed Him up and made Him hail with gladness the final grapple with sin and weakness, the approaching severance from earthly love and life that was to issue in the salvation of man and redound to the glory of God. "Father, glorify Thy Name. Reveal Thy Fatherly nature to mankind." And there came a voice from heaven, "I have glorified it, and will glorify it again." And Jesus said, "This voice came not for My sake, but for yours." There was no need that the word should be uttered aloud to reach His heart. The inward struggle is over and His Passion is commencing, and is to issue in a triumph that shall prove a sentence on the world's standards of beauty and pleasure because it shall end in the defeat and expulsion of the ruler of this world. "For," He said, "if so be that I be lifted

up, I shall draw men to Myself." Here we notice that the tone of Divine assertiveness is immediately checked. "If so be that I be lifted up," He said, knowing the frailty of His human nature, knowing that all things were in His Father's hands and that His very life depended on that Father. The hour is approaching, and His flesh is shrinking from the greatness of the contest that was to reach another climax of agony in Gethsemane. There is unspeakable pathos in the Greek word ἐάν. The whole scene, described with so much *naïveté* and power, reveals the depths of the Saviour's soul. There is infinite suffering and self-control in the broken sentences of the soliloquy, "Now is My soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father, save Me from this hour. But for this cause came I unto this hour."

The weakness is mastered and pain passes into exultation. "Father, glorify Thy Name." But there is justice, stern justice in the cry, "Now is the judgment of this world. Now shall the prince of this world be cast out." The victory is to the good. The moral forces of righteousness and truth shall prevail over all that makes for selfishness and sin. Again, the words that introduce the scene in the upper room—"Jesus, knowing that His hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them unto the end"—add a strange thrill to the description of the feet-washing. The wonderful self-mastery and self-forgetfulness of the Master of men is nowhere revealed with such power and pathos as in the scene where His foreknowledge must add poignancy to His own pain, but where His sympathy with others causes Him to forget the sorrow of which His Divine nature makes Him doubly conscious. And the tragic situation is intensified by the diabolic

presence of Judas, in whom the spirit of hatred has now free course. The dramatic genius of the writer caused him to seize upon this contrast of Judas' hate and Jesus' love. For the dark shadow of such hate throws into bolder relief the glory of such love.

In his description of the prayer of Jesus, the writer again is most natural. And such naturalness is beyond the reach of art. For as the Master had concluded this discourse He lifted up His eyes to heaven and said, "Father, the hour is come; glorify Thy Son, that Thy Son also may glorify Thee." Strange are the words of rapture and yearning that follow. The Saviour's mood is highly exalted. The tone of jubilation arises from the sense of the nearness of the crisis. The protection, the sanctification, the union, the perfection and the love of His disciples—these are the themes which He would naturally choose at such a time. And the words that conclude the prayer, "O righteous Father, the world hath not known Thee, but I have known Thee, and these have known that Thou hast sent Me. And I have declared unto them Thy Name, and will declare it; that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them and I in them," carry us over Gethsemane and its dark agony. For upon that gloomy picture the Evangelist dare not linger. It has already been painted by others. And to pause to describe it now were to lose the lofty tone of self-surrender in which these words are uttered. The action now becomes quicker, the language more terse, the characters more numerous. The drama progresses towards its climax. But in the same calm tone of devotion, He rebukes the violence of Peter and He hails the approach of the end, "The cup which My Father hath given Me, shall I not drink it?"[1] No more

[1] xviii. 11.

inward struggles are related, no harrowing details are added. The Evangelist describes the closing scenes from the vantage-ground of his after life. The end, indeed, is death, but death means accomplishment and victory. The Father is glorified in the self-sacrifice of the Son, and His will "is finished." Thus the perfect life is rounded off, and our impression is not one of infinite sorrow, but of pain dissolved in the joy of victory. The spiritual order is not dependent on the world of sense. It submits, but in its submission is the prophecy of triumph.

Such is the process of this drama, which turns upon spiritual love and worldly hate, belief and unbelief. Into its texture are interwoven many episodes that serve to illuminate the Master's character and environment. Many light, vivid touches give life and movement to the tragedy, while sharply contrasted characters and situations serve to throw into greater prominence the central figure of Christ. There is much skill, for example, in the portrayal of Judas. Subtle, silent and solitary, he is like a serpent in his impassiveness. His character is an enigma. If questioned on the motive of his crime, he would probably retort like Iago—

> "Demand me nothing, but what you know you know;
> From this time forth I never will speak word."

His presence is a dark shadow that grows larger on the wall and spells death to his Master and ruin for himself. Of that baneful influence the Master is painfully conscious. "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is διάβολος?"[1] The Jews declared that Jesus and John the Baptist had a devil,[2] meaning that they were full of strange fancies. But this word has a sinister sense. One

[1] Devil, vi. 70. [2] δαιμόνιον ἔχεις vii 20; Matt. xi. 18.

of the twelve is a perverter of good unto evil, a slanderer and enemy of the good. And his question, "Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor?"[1] shows it. In the upper room the Master becomes keenly sensitive of the malign presence. And the writer of the drama makes the readers share that feeling by using his colours in such a way that the chief interest is centred in Jesus and that silent figure by His side, into whose heart the devil had already put the betrayal of his Master. After the feet-washing, Jesus said, "I speak not of you all. I know whom I have chosen. But that the scripture may be fulfilled, 'He that eateth bread with Me hath lifted up his heel against Me.'" To the disciple that He loved best Jesus reveals the name of him that loved Him least. And after the sop Satan entered into Judas, and Jesus said, "What thou doest, do quickly." And he, having received the sop, went immediately out, and the dark curtain of night falls upon him and his treason. After his retirement there is a strong reaction in the Saviour's mood. He is now able to pour out the wealth of His love unrestrained by any hostile influence. Now He can say, "Now is the Son of man glorified." For the haggard shadow of Judas has been swallowed up in the night. The whole scene is recorded with dramatic power and verve. What is narrative in the Synoptists is tragedy here. For the sentence is pronounced without reprieve, at all events as far as this world is concerned, by Him who for judgment came into the world, "And not one of them is lost save the son of perdition."

On the whole, the general effect of the Apostle's art is that the Saviour's life is presented in one long divinely protracted contest, one great continuous sacrifice. The Cross is anticipated by the Baptist's

[1] John xii. 15.

words, "Behold the Lamb of God." The glory cloud of the Word shines upon the silver page, but the letters are written in blood-red type, and the words of life and love throb with the thought of the uplifting of the Son of man and the dissolving of the Divine corn-seed in the fields of human life. In this life of the Master there is a gathering intensity of meaning, a climacteric force in the marshalling of events. The story gathers glory as it moves from eternity to eternity, while the writer grows in dramatic power as he presses forward to write the tragedy of the life of the Son of God, who became the Son of man to make the sons of men sons of God. As the manifestation of God's grace, and the revelation of God's truth in human characters, that life is graphically and dramatically conceived. Around it surges the battle of faith and doubt, of darkness and light. The tragic interest of the contest rises as the plot thickens. We are carried onwards over a smooth but deep-flowing and resistless river of life, until the tide has us in its grasp and we are borne—

> "wonderfully and fearfully afar
> Out to the mighty main."

As in a great drama our attention is secured from the very first, and we endure one throbbing hour of suspense until the crisis has come and gone, so in this Gospel the hour of agony is long drawn out, the climax to which we are hastening is postponed time after time, while the plot slowly ripens to catastrophe and the sorrow's crown is surely won.

Nor is the conflict only between the Word and His foes, those who will not accept His revelation, those who oppose Him at every point, but also between His humanity and His Divinity. His flesh shrinks from the contest. His flesh feels unkindness and depression. His soul is keenly sensitive of the slightest breath of hostility. There

are no unlawful desires in Him, but there is yet a discord over which He triumphs. For He—the Author of our salvation—was made morally perfect by sufferings,[1] and His life of moral struggle with the powers of evil is crowned by a victory which has been continuous, but which becomes permanent on the Cross. It does not detract from His glory to find that He grew in the knowledge of men.[2] It was part of His humiliation to be limited in certain points where His Divinity touched His human nature. There were certain moral qualities, such as obedience and patience, faith and sympathy, necessary for the discharge of His function as the high priest of humanity. And the Word attained these things through the moral discipline of an experience like our own. And out of this conflict the faith of the disciples is slowly but gradually developed. The writer's own love for his Master makes him anxious. And this personal solicitude for the Master's safety and success becomes ours too, until the sense of absolute attainment helps us also to "see and believe."

"Christ ist erstanden,
Selig der Liebende,
Der die betrübende
Heilsam' und übende
Prüfung bestanden."

CHAPTER VII

THE ARTISTIC STRUCTURE OF THE GOSPEL

THE dramatic development of the Fourth Gospel has already been indicated in connection with the well-marked "hours" or critical periods in

[1] Heb. ii. 19. [2] John ii. 25.

the Master's earthly life. Its dramatic unity is no less proved by the nexus and naturalness of the scenes which follow each other in rapid succession from the picture of the waiting Baptist and his followers by the banks of the Jordan to the closing scene of the drama, where Thomas makes his confession of faith. No Evangelist had a keener eye for a situation or a truer sense of vivid narrative. The variety, vividness, and progress of the scenes, together with the number, individuality, and distinctness of the characters, the play of question and retort, the pointed and allusive manner of the Master's sayings, the reality of His surroundings, and the stately march of the narrative, give dramatic interest and movement to the work. Like the Book of Job, its opening strains are from heaven, and the soul of the protagonist, with all reverence be it spoken, is revealed in His discourses and soliloquies, like the Hamlet of Shakespeare.

The Gospel falls into five divisions or chapters, which may be termed *episodes*, with a prologue and epilogue or exodus. The Prologue is appropriately constructed. The testimony of the Baptist inserted as an interlude of human music in the Divine Anthem of the Word is a necessary link in the great chain of reasoning that is gradually let down from the heights of existence and light, which no man can approach unto, to the levels of human thought and being, until the Word who made the world and giveth light stands revealed as an historical figure upon the stage of life. And the subsequent appearance of the Baptist, his laconic reply to the deputation of the Jews, his indication of Jesus, just returned from His Temptation in the wilderness, as the Messiah, the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world, his record of that wonderful promise that buoyed up and inspired his life, and its equally wonderful fulfilment at the Baptism of Jesus form

a suitable preface to the selection of the disciples, which is described with a delicate and graphic pen that makes the figures live and move and speak before us. Nowhere do we find Aristotle's direction that the poet, when he constructs his plot and writes his tragedy, should regard himself as much as possible as a spectator,[1] more faithfully followed than in the course of this drama.

I. The time of John i. 19—ii. 12 is evidently spring, not winter, *pace* Canon Sanday. The visit of Jesus to the Baptist may have synchronized with the preparations for the Passover in the month Adar,[2] while His sojourn and fast in the wilderness, of which St. Matthew and St. Luke give details, would, in the light of John i., appear to be due not only to a desire to reflect and pray, but also to the feeling of a great self-restraint in order to check the urgings of His Messianic consciousness and His Divine mission. On His return from the wilderness, with all the marks of recent struggle and fasting,[3] like all the indications of His sufferings, implied rather than apparent in this Gospel, He is pointed out with the significant remark, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the *world*"—words that have a true Passover ring.[4] Passover was a favourite time for baptism. It was after the Passover of John ii. 13, that Jesus' disciples baptized in Judæa while John was baptizing in Aenon.[5] The time of Passover would also account for the presence of so many Galileans in Judæa, while the very atmosphere of the early scenes of this Gospel is spring, the budding life of the year, in the buoyant sunshine when men's

[1] *Poetics*, xvii.

[2] *Cf.* xii. 55: "And the Jews' Passover was at hand, and many went out of the country up to Jerusalem before the Passover to purify themselves."

[3] *Cf* Isa. liii. 3.

[4] *Cf.* "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. v. 7).

[5] John iv. 22–23.

hearts are most ready for a change of life; when Nathanael, an Israelite without the guile of Jacob, is meditating under a fig tree, sheltered by its foliage from the heat of the sun. Might not all this have happened a month before the passover?[1] This interview with Nathanael is peculiarly bright and spontaneous, and suggestive of the problems to be faced and solved in the drama.

The next scene, the wedding in Cana of Galilee, is still within the Saviour's circle. The picture is real and vividly drawn. The request of Mary, the reply of Jesus, the ruler of the feast who compliments the bridegroom, the obedient servants who fill the waterpots to the very top,[2] are effectively indicated by an eye-witness, who succeeds in conveying a distinct impression of aloofness and meditation in the manner of Jesus that prepares us for His subsequent appearance and action in the Temple. Dr. Wendt,[3] in his work *Das Johannesevangelium*, describes the purification as it stands in this Gospel as "a solitary deed, unrelated and without consequences." But it had significance in its setting, and had influence upon the subsequent attitude of Jesus to the Jews. The Lord's manner at the wedding feast was repellent. The confiding Mother is almost rebuffed. "Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine *hour*[4] is not yet come." That *hour* does not mean the time for the sign is clear from the use of *hour* in this Gospel to denote some momentous occurrence, some epoch in the life of our Lord, *e.g.* "Father, save Me from this hour"[5]—from this period of stress and strain. While meditating a course of action that might open the eyes of the Jews, His train of thought was disturbed for a moment, to be resumed again after the help suggested had been rendered. No decisive deed followed

[1] *Cf.* John ii. 13.
[2] ἕως ἄνω.
[3] See Chapter III.
[4] ὥρα.
[5] John xii. 27. See previous chapter.

immediately; but His unrest may be read in the words, "And they continued there (in Capernaum) not many days." [1] His soul filled with a mighty purpose now that the consciousness of His mission and His origin has become awake, He follows the crowd of pilgrims to Jerusalem. Each annual visit since His twelfth year had but served to increase His indignation against the wrong use of the precincts of the Temple—His Father's House—and now especially reminded of His mission, He is prepared to display and assert in public the powers and claims of which He had already given evidence in the private circle of His friends and disciples. The "hour" has come, and armed with the symbol of authority, the scourge, He expelled the dealers and their sheep and oxen from the Temple courts [2] and overturned the money and the tables of the money-changers [3]—vigorous actions vividly described, but which failed to evoke the faith desired. The protest of the Jews is followed by the prophecy. The end, though still remote, is seen in the hour of disappointment, but in the halo of the Resurrection. "Destroy this shrine,[4] and in three days I will raise it up." But He is repelled by the hostile attitude of the Jews and is thrown back upon Himself. An assumed aloofness conceals His feelings, which are seldom betrayed in this Gospel.[5] He experiences the first pangs of disappointment. "And though He performed many signs and many believed on His name, yet He would not trust Himself to them, for He was beginning to know what was in man." [6] Nicodemus, a ruler, who had noted the signs and words of the young preacher from Galilee, came to Him privately by night, not from fear of the Jews, but because he was unable to break down that barrier of reserve in public, and learns the inwardness of

[1] ii. 12. [2] ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. [3] κολλυβισταί.
[4] ναόν. [5] But see xi. 35, 38; xix. 28. [6] ii. 25.

the spiritual change that admits to the Kingdom of God. An alteration in His method of self-revelation, a more cautious manner, a grand reserve, are the results of an episode which is described as "unrelated and without consequence."

The conversation on spiritual regeneration, which gradually rises to strange heights of mysticism, is set most naturally in the soft shadow and expectant hush of an Eastern twilight. For spiritual gloom lies heaviest upon the soul before the dawn of spiritual light. The discussion between the Baptist's follower and a Jew on the subject of purification calls forth the generous testimony of the Baptist, but reveals a latent jealousy of the Master, who was induced by the increasing publicity of His own mission among the Pharisees to withdraw from Judæa.

The monotony of the return journey is relieved by the interview with the Samaritan woman, another picture, painted by one who may have seen and heard all. The weariness of the Master, His casual posture, the arrival of the woman with the waterpot to draw water from the deep well, the amazement and curiosity of the woman as the conversation gradually became as deep as the well beside her, were quietly noted by one whom we may, with Canon Sanday,[1] picture to ourselves as "seated a pace or two away and not wishing to obtrude His presence, but eagerly drinking in all that passed." The environment, "this mountain," the field which Jacob gave to his son Joseph, the well of Jacob, are historical, the experiences real and human, the speakers flesh and blood. The haste of the woman, leaving her waterpot to call her friends, the return of the disciples, the hospitality and eagerness of the country-folk, their welcome of Christ, His remarks regarding His food and the fields "already white to

[1] *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 86.

harvest," and the speech of the Samaritan—"Now we believe that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world,"[1] form a picturesque setting of an impressive discourse on spiritual worship. This welcome given to the returning Jesus by the warm-hearted Samaritans, a striking contrast with the unsympathetic attitude of the Jews of Jerusalem, prepares us for the second miracle in Cana, and the interview with the courtier, whose tone of aristocratic hauteur gives way to parental anxiety—"Lord, come down ere my child die." Such may be described as the close of the first chapter or episode in the drama of this Gospel.

II. The conflict presently begins between the Messiah and His people. The scene is laid in Jerusalem at the sheepgate, and it is the sabbath day. At the Bethesda a crowd of poor and infirm people are lying in the shade of the porches. Among others an old man, an invalid of thirty and eight years, is stretched upon the marble steps, unable for the crush to reach the health-giving waters when they are disturbed, but in answer to the command of Jesus he takes up his pallet and walks. The Jews expostulate with the man for carrying his pallet on the sabbath, and demand the name of the healer. But Jesus had disappeared in the crowd. Afterwards finding the man in the Temple and discerning his unworthy character, He bade him go and sin no more lest a worse evil should befall him. The man went straightway and informed against Jesus. The deed of mercy thus became fraught with disastrous consequences. Henceforth Jesus is a marked if not a persecuted Man.[2] The scene, which concludes with the noble peroration, "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father," etc.,[3] is a vivid transcript from life. An important indication of time is given in John v. 35, where the

[1] iv. 42. [2] v. 15. [3] v. 45.

Baptist, whose utterance in iii. 28–36 contains a presentiment of doom, "He must increase, but I must decrease," and whose popularity is evidently waning in iv. 1, is referred to as a lamp that no longer shines: "He *was* the burning and shining lamp, and ye *were willing* for a time to rejoice in his light."

The scene is now shifted to the picturesque shores of the Sea of Galilee. The surroundings are painted with few but vivid touches. It is just before the Passover. Multitudes follow Jesus, as in Matthew v. 1. He withdraws to the mountain, and there *sits* with His disciples, but seeing the people approach, He questions Philip about bread for them. Philip calculates the number sufficient, but Andrew points out the small boy. The minute memory, "Now there was much grass in the place," the Saviour's orders and His taking the loaves and His thanksgiving, give an air of reality to the scene, which is heightened by the expression of the people, "This is indeed the Prophet that cometh into the world," and by the attempt on the part of some, evidently zealots, to seize Him and make Him a king, which was thwarted by His withdrawal into the mountain. But the disciples have already taken to their boat, and when they were in the very middle of the lake the storm arose. Jesus appeared walking on the waters, and they were afraid, but presently they were at the shore. The people, in the meanwhile, having waited the arrival of some boats from Tiberias, crossed over after Jesus. But He, evidently discerning among them the hostile deputation from Jerusalem,[1] rebukes them for seeking Him from an unworthy motive. They demand a sign,[2] and then proceed to cavil openly at His discourse concerning the Bread of Life, and induce many to leave Him. The pathetic question, "Will ye also go

[1] Matt. xv. 1. [2] John vi. 30; *cf.* Matt. xv. 1.

away?" addressed to the twelve is answered by Peter with the same spontaneity as in the Synoptic narrative, where his confession of faith, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,"[1] occurred shortly after a similar conflict with the Jerusalem deputation. The prediction of the Betrayal intensifies the dramatic interest of the passage, which bears the impress of an observant mind. With the words, "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a *devil?*"[2] the Master openly reveals His discovery of the character of Judas, perhaps in recent transactions with the deputation; and the second division of the drama concludes. The conflict has begun. The toils are being drawn round the Saviour's feet. The presence of a malignant spirit becomes a new force in the tragedy, blighting His happiness and work.

III. In the third act Our Lord is in Galilee, engaged in active missionary work.[3] The Feast of the Tabernacles is at hand. The taunt of the brethren in Galilee, the Jews' quest at the Feast, and the murmurings of the crowds as they incline now this way and now that are vividly portrayed. But in the midst of the Feast the expected Teacher arrives and speaks boldly. The Jews marvel at His knowledge, and the pilgrims deny His charge, "Who goeth about to kill thee?"[4] while the Jerusalem populace are amazed at His boldness—"Is not this He whom they seek to kill?" "Can it be that the rulers know indeed that this is the Christ? Howbeit we know this Man whence He is. But when the Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence He is."[5] Then the voice of Jesus is heard saying, "Ye both know Me and whence I am. But ye know not Him that sent Me." A movement is

[1] Matt. xvi. 16. [2] John vi. 70.
[3] This is suggested by the tense of the verb περιεπάτει (vii. 1).
[4] vii. 20. [5] vii. 28.

made by some of the servants of the hierarchy to seize Him, but their hands are miraculously held back, for His hour has not yet come. And many of the pilgrims believed on Him, saying, "Will the Christ, when He cometh, do more signs than this Man?" The three parties in the crowd, the hierarchical faction, the pilgrims, of whom many believed, and certain who belonged to the populace of the city, are vividly described and give animation to the scene.[1] A diversion is now created by a band of officers of the Sandehrin, who are spell-bound by His words. The occurrences of the following day when the procession took place from the pool of Siloam are even more interesting. Then Jesus stands apart and cries aloud, "If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink. He that believeth on Me, as the scripture saith, out of him shall flow rivers of living water." The commotion among the bystanders is well described. Some said, "This is indeed the prophet," others, "This is the Christ," and others, evidently Judæan folk, "Nay, doth Christ come out of Galilee?" There was a division among them, and some, probably the officers of the Sanhedrin, would have seized Him, but their hands are held back.

Two short scenes follow here. In the first the officers make their report before the Sanhedrin, and Nicodemus makes his bold protest in the name of liberty; while the second is the so-called *pericope adulterae*, which has a questionable right to be included in this Gospel.

The next scene is in the Court of the Women near the two great candelabra, types of the pillars of light. The discourse on light, which has thus an appropriate setting, deals with the same three topics, judgment, evidence,[2] and the knowledge of the Father that formed the texts of the discourses of

[1] οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ὁ ὄχλος, τινὲς ἐκ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν. [2] μαρτυρία.

v. 19–38. But there the Baptist is the light of the Jews. "He was the burning and the shining lamp, and ye were willing for a time to rejoice in his light," [1] while here Jesus is "the light *of the world*." [2] A stage of advance is, therefore, to be registered. The exasperation of the Pharisees is also more marked and their opposition better organized. "But no man laid hands on Him, for His hour was not yet come." [3] The opportunity passes, and Jesus resumes His discourse. "I go away, and ye shall seek Me, and ye shall die in your sin: for where I go ye cannot come," [4] words that recall vii. 33, "Ye shall seek Me, and ye shall not find Me: and where I am ye cannot come." But it is not an instance of idle repetition. For in the former passage the Jews asked one another, "Is He about to go to the dispersion of the Greeks and teach the Greeks?" [5] and showed that they were surprised by the utterance; whereas in the latter our Lord repeats the statement with the thrice-repeated doom, "Ye shall die in your sins;" [6] the first utterance of which evidently suggested the new question of the Jews, "Will He put Himself to death?" [7] There is also a marked advance in the words, "Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world," [8] and in the foreshadowing of the lifting up of the Son of man in vii. 38.

Many seem to believe on Him. Turning to those, He proceeds to put their nascent faith to a severe test. "If ye abide in My word, then are ye My disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." [9] While they stand silent, the Jewish party attempt to weaken the impression Jesus has made by affecting to think that some insult to their father Abraham and their

[1] John v. 35. [2] viii. 12. [3] viii. 20. [4] viii. 21.
[5] vii. 35. [6] "Sin," viii. 21; "sins," viii. 24, 25.
[7] viii. 22. [8] viii. 24. [9] viii. 31.

freedom has been offered. "We are the seed of Abraham, and were never in bondage to any." They feign that their boasted lineage has been impugned. But in the following words their spiritual lineage is traced by a strict logical process. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will to do."[1] And the gauntlet of innocence is thrown down with the challenge, "Which of you convicteth Me of sin?"[2] If the scene of the adulteress[3] be genuine, it is quite possible that some of those who were there "convinced by their conscience"[4] were among the present audience. This would give an added significance to the Master's challenge. In answer to it the Jewish faction shouted, "Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil?" "I have not a devil," He answers; "but I honour My Father, and ye dishonour Me. If any one keep My word, he shall never have the vision of death."[5] "Abraham is dead," they cried, again harping on their ancestor, "and the prophets, and Thou sayest, If any man shall keep My word, he shall never taste of death. Art Thou greater than our father Abraham?" This was their challenge, and it was accepted. "Before Abraham was I am." They understood His claim at last, and as they look round for stones to crush the life of the blasphemer He has disappeared from their view.

The scene of the blind beggar that follows is full of dramatic movement and vivid character-drawing. It arises naturally and logically from the circumstances of the previous scene, and shows the now fixed determination of the Jewish party to crush Jesus and to persecute His followers. Our Lord gives a practical illustration of Himself as the Light of the World,[6] one of the themes of His discourse in the previous scene. This is a spiritual

[1] viii. 44. [2] viii. 46. [3] viii. 1–11.
[4] viii. 9. [5] viii. 51. [6] ix. 5.

connection. The character of the beggar is consistently drawn as from the life. The argument is equally consistent. The scene, introduced by the query of the disciples, "Who did *sin*, this man or his parents, that he was *born* blind?"[1] closes with the sentence of the Sanhedrin, "Thou wast altogether *born in sins*, and dost thou teach us?"[2] In the following scene the Master gave to the outcast, whose rugged and original character is manifest in his words and sufferings, a special and spontaneous revelation of Himself as the Son of God;[3] and the man *worshipped* Him.[4] This is the only occasion in this Gospel in which Jesus accepts worship, unless the movement of the soldiers in the Garden be so regarded. In itself this act of worship is a climax, a suitable climax, not only of the scene in which the beggar figures, but of the whole course and progress of the drama to this point.

The next scene consists of the apologue of the Door and the Shepherd, to which the question of the Pharisees, who had overheard His remark to the beggar, "Are we blind also?" gave rise. The environment is the same and the spiritual connexion evident. For the parables of the Door and the Shepherd have a manifest relation to the action of the false shepherds who have closed their door in the face of one poor sheep. At the conclusion of the discourse there is a division among the audience. "He hath a devil and is mad;[5] why hear ye Him?" cry some, and others answer, "These are not the works of one possessed with a devil. Can a devil open the eyes of the blind?" Some months later our Lord is in Jerusalem again. It is the Feast of the Dedication, the commemoration of Israel's deliverance from Syria. The time is winter and the

[1] ix. 2. [2] ix. 34. [3] ix. 36. [4] ix. 38.
[5] μαίνεται. This is the only passage in the Gospels in which this word is used of Jesus.

place the Stoa of Solomon. As he walked in the colonnade he is surrounded by Jews, who evidently resume the argument where it had been left by demanding, "How long dost Thou keep us in suspense? If Thou art the Christ, tell us plainly." [1] In answer He appeals to His works, reiterates the teaching of the Shepherd, and describes His relation to the Father as something considerably higher than that claimed for the ideal Messianic Deliverer. "I and My Father are one." [2] This, then, is the reason why He who had expounded the worship of the Father to the Samaritan woman [3] accepted the worship of the beggar.[4] On another occasion,[5] when showing His disciples that they had reason for joy at His departure, He says, "Ye would rejoice because I said I go to the Father, for My Father *is greater than I*." "I and My Father are one," is the climax of His self-interpretation to the Jews, and provokes another hostile attack on their part to stone and seize Him. But He escapes from them and withdraws beyond Jordan. This is the conclusion of the third division or act.

IV. The fourth act or episode consists of practically one scene, the resurrection of Lazarus. The circumstances are consistent with those of the preceding scene, as is evident from the apparently undesigned remarks quoted by the writer. "Rabbi, the Jews were just now seeking to stone Thee, and dost Thou go there?" [6] "Come, let us die with Him;" [7] and the manner in which Martha, fearful of betraying Jesus to the Jews who were with her, says secretly [8] to her sister, "The Master is here, and calleth thee." [9] The scene itself is drawn in perfect harmony with all that has preceded and all that follows in this Gospel. The remonstrance of

[1] x. 24. [2] x. 30. Lit. "one thing." [3] vi. 23.
[4] ix. 38. [5] xiv. 28. [6] xi. 8.
[7] x. 16. [8] λάθρα. [9] xi. 28.

the disciples, the devotion and despair in the utterance of Thomas, the movements of the sisters, the minute details that follow, are vividly and naturally drawn as if from the life. They seem beyond the power of invention. The scene is certainly not due to an attempt to clothe reverence in an unnatural form or to give literary expression and actual justification to the belief in Jesus as "the Resurrection and the Life."[1] But it is evident that this scene was intended to illustrate and lead up to the Resurrection scene of xx. 1–18, between which and it there are many points of similarity and of difference, and as such it has an important place in the drama and bearing on its development, even apart from the position that the raising of Lazarus occupies in the tragedy of the Master's earthly life. The magnitude of this event becomes apparent in the scene that follows, where informers lay the matter before the Jewish council in the Temple. They make it a matter of their political life and safety to accomplish His death: "If we let Him alone like this, all men will believe on Him, and the Romans will come and take our place and nation."[2] But Caiaphas the Sadducee sees the opportunity of winning the Roman favour. "It is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not"[3]—a remarkable sentence reported by one known to the high priest.[4] The work of Jesus thus assumes a political significance, and His death becomes a measure of State policy, deliberately carried out by the representatives of the Jewish nation. From that day Jesus walked no more openly among the Jews, and departed into the wilderness of Ephraim.[5] In the mean time the Council have given strict orders for information of His movements.[6] This prepares the way for the

[1] xi. 25. [2] xi. 48. [3] xi. 50.
[4] See xviii. 14, 15. [5] xi. 54. [6] xi. 57.

betrayal, and concludes the fourth division of the Gospel.

V. We now enter upon the final conflict and catastrophe of the fifth act, in which are found the closing scenes of our Lord's earthly ministry. It is six days before the Passover, and the place is the house of Lazarus in Bethany. Lazarus reclines at the feast with many others, some of whom had come to see him and not for Jesus' sake. The malignant spirit who was to bring about the ruin of his Master murmurs at the extravagance of the honour done to Him by Mary. "Let her alone," He said, reading the woman's purpose; "this she hath kept for the day of my entombment." This incident reveals the shadow of the tragedy and heightens its pathos. The drama is progressing surely if slowly. A short scene is interposed between this and the entry into Jerusalem. It is the Council Chamber. Reports of the supper of Lazarus have reached them, and they resolve upon the death of Lazarus, also "because that by reason of him many of the Jews seceded and believed on Jesus."[1] This evidence of the determination of the Jews to leave nothing undone to accomplish the destruction of their victim prepares us for the subtly planned and carefully arranged steps in the arrest and trials of Jesus which are described in this Gospel. These scenes in the Council must have emanated from a Jewish source, doubtless Nicodemus. Their place in this Gospel is appropriate from the light they throw on what is passing behind the scenes, as it were, of the drama, and also from their alleged connection with "one known to the high priest."

In the account of the entry into the city the writer points out that many people went out to meet Jesus on account of the raising of Lazarus.[2] This miracle, therefore, occupies an important place

[1] xii. 11. [2] xii. 18.

in the Gospel, and the account cannot be removed without injury to its very structure. The writer's remark, "The disciples did not understand these things at the first," [1] gives an air of naturalness to the narrative, and shows anxiety to avoid leaving a false impression. As evidence of such a temper, it is as invaluable to those who believe in the genuineness of the work as it is upsetting to those who doubt it. The visit of the Greeks, a scene full of natural colouring and interesting detail, follows. The strangers approach Philip, the disciple with the Greek name, and he consults Andrew. Together they tell Jesus, who, discerning the far-reaching significance of the visit, says, "The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified." The parable of the seed-corn illustrates the law of self-sacrifice. Troubled at the contemplation of His own death, He says, "Now is My heart troubled,[2] and what shall I say? Father, save Me from this hour. But for this cause came I unto this hour." This momentary indecision in a life of which every step hitherto seems prearranged gives another touch of reality to this passage. It is but a momentary indecision, and ends in self-abnegation. "Father, glorify *Thy* Name." A voice came from heaven, saying, "I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again." This is certainly a strange incident, but the spiritual atmosphere was tense enough for such a revelation, and the impressions of the people, some of whom said it thundered, and others that an angel spoke to Him, are faithfully noted. The Saviour, however, observes, "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the ruler of this world be cast out. And I, if so be that I be lifted up, shall draw all men unto Myself," [3] by which saying He

[1] xii. 16.

[2] In xiv. 1, He says to His disciples, "Let not *your* heart be troubled." He knows what trouble of heart is.

[3] xii. 32.

signified, according to the writer, the kind of death He should die. This is the supreme point of our Lord's revelation of Himself to the world as represented by the Jews. It was reached in a passage of intense spiritual strain and suppressed feeling, and arises naturally out of the circumstances of the visit of the Greeks. The importance of the moment is also indicated by the grave warning the Master gave in answer to the casual query of some of the bystanders, "We have heard out of the law that the Christ abideth for ever, and how sayest Thou, The Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?"[1] "Yet a little while is the light with you. Walk while ye have the light, lest the darkness overtake[2] you. While ye have the light believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light." This gracious invitation is His last word to the people who have rejected Him. It is noteworthy that the Evangelist, when commenting on that rejection, applies to His case the passage Isaiah vi. 1, which had reference to the Father's glory. St. Paul[3] applies it to the Spirit. Our Lord withdraws from the people. His public mission has terminated. The scenes that follow are concerned with His own disciples and His doctrine. But as if for the last time, He comes forward as a solitary figure upon the stage, and sums up the subjects of His doctrine and mission in a few pregnant words.

The scene of the washing of feet bears the marks of an eye-witness, and is dramatically conceived. The Master's preparations, Peter's remonstrance, and his earnest request are drawn from the life. The

[1] xii. 35.

[2] καταλάβῃ. *Cf.* i. 5, "The darkness overcame it not" (κατέλαβεν). This correspondence, like many other minute correspondences in this Gospel, testifies to the unity as well as art of the work.

[3] Acts xxviii. 25.

words, "Ye are clean, but *not all*," [1] are an omen of the storm that is soon to break over them. The Saviour's evident distress,[2] and His more definite words, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray Me," add to the tension of the situation. The gestures of the disciples are naturally described. Peter nods to John, and John, who is reclining on the shoulder of Jesus, leaning back his head,[3] asks, "Who is it?" And the answer came, "He it is to whom I shall give the sop after I have dipped it." The sop is handed to Judas. Then the evil thought arises in the man's mind. The words, "What thou doest, do quickly," confirm him in his intention. He went out, and *it was night* within and without.

Then follows the discourse in the upper room,[4] consisting largely of answers to questions such as might naturally be put by men as they conversed reclining at a meal. The general nature of the conversation, the variety of the topics, and the brief, sententious manner of the answers are in keeping with the environment of the upper room, and are in striking contrast with the continuous discourses,[5] which are represented as uttered on the way to the Garden. The connection and development of thought in these discourses is a noticeable feature. Here it suffices to call attention to the atmosphere of sorrow and the solemn awe which hangs around the Saviour and His disciples. The silence and solitude of the midnight hour and the weird stillness of that midnight walk can be felt as the deep mysteries of the Godhead are revealed to man. The thanksgiving prayer fitly crowns the discourses by gathering up into one sublime summary their thoughts and themes. The prayer, which was evidently uttered in the hearing of the disciples, relieves the tension.

[1] John xiii. 19. [2] xiii. 21. [3] ἀναπεσών.
[4] John xiv. [5] xv.–xvi. inclusive.

Its note is glory, the glory of consummation and victory after defeat, sorrow, and trial.

The following scene in the Garden brings us back to the field of action. It is full of movement. It marks the beginning of what Aristotle would call the λύσις or *dénouement* of the drama, its μετάβασις.[1] The traitor, with a company of soldiers and some Temple officials, disturbs the vigil of the Saviour and His disciples. "The lanterns and torches and weapons" intimidate all but Him. He stands forth and demands, "Whom seek ye?" "Jesus of Nazareth," they reply. "I am He," He answered. This happens twice. On the second occasion He said, "Let these go their way." Judas, we are told, was standing with them, but the Saviour is spared the profanation of his kiss, which may have been given afterwards, but here would have been unsuitable, as it would have lowered the tone of the scene. The men, prepared for resistance or escape, are confused, and move backwards and fall upon their faces, as if in the presence of Deity. The strange manner in which the Master had accosted them, the weirdness of the hour, their superstitious fears and imaginings may have bewildered them for the moment. We believe, however, that there was something more, the supernatural. Here it is to be noticed that the ἀναγνώρισις, discovery or recognition, which was frequently employed in the Greek drama,[2] and generally is accompanied with the περιπετεία, or reversal of fortunes, as in the *Oidipous*, plays a great part in the following scenes, and is used with remarkable effect. On the one hand, we have the discovery attempted by the soldiers in this chapter, and that attempted by Pilate in the eighteenth; and on the other, those made by Mary Magdalene and Thomas in the twentieth.

[1] Aristotle, *Poetics*, xviii. [2] *Ibid.* xi., xvi.

The people surround Jesus. Malchus seizes Him. Peter strikes and is rebuked. "The cup which My Father hath given Me to drink, shall I not drink it?" The prisoner is bound and led to Annas, Peter and another disciple known to the high priest following. The manner in which the latter disciple obtains admission for Peter is natural. But as Peter is entering he is accosted by the maid. "Art thou, as well as he, one of this Man's disciples?" And the other hears the lying response. Peter stands warming himself at the fire of coals, doubtless afraid to enter the audience chamber, into which the other hurried, lest he should provoke another challenge. In the mean time the other disciple is listening to the examination of his Master by Annas. He hears the high priest's question and the response, and he sees the blow and hears the protest. This examination over, the Saviour is sent as a criminal before the tribunal of Caiaphas, the real high priest, and as He passes bound through the courtyard, with the other disciple following Him, they hear the servants questioning Peter twice, and his denials. It is to be noticed that the writer of this Gospel writes from the point of view of this disciple, and makes it possible for him to have heard the three denials.

The next scene is before the Prætorium, the time being about 4 a.m. Pilate stands on the steps, confronting the priests, who would not enter for fear of polluting themselves. The dialogue that follows between them is given a more dramatic and literary turn than in the Synoptists. Then Pilate enters into the Judgment Hall in order to examine the prisoner privately, and questions Him. It seems from xviii. 28, that it was permissible to others to enter, so that the disciple who was known to the high priest may have followed in with Jesus and overheard the ensuing conversation, which is

likewise cast in a dramatic form. The whole scene is dramatically constructed.

Pilate : Art Thou the King of the Jews ?

Jesus : Of thyself dost thou say this, or did others tell thee of Me ?

Pilate : Am I a Jew ? Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered Thee to me. What hast Thou done ?

Jesus : My Kingdom is not of this world. Were My Kingdom of this world My servants would contend that I should not be handed up to the Jews. But My Kingdom is not from hence.

Pilate : Then Thou art a King ?

Jesus : Thou sayest that I am a King. For this cause have I been born, and for this cause have I come into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth. Every one who is of the truth heareth My voice.

Pilate : What is truth ?

(Pilate, convinced that the Man is not a κακοποιός, or malefactor, leaves the Prætorium without waiting for an answer, and addresses the Jews on the steps.)

Pilate : I find in Him no guilt at all. But ye have a custom that I should release one man unto you at the Passover. Shall I release unto you the King of the Jews ?

Jews (*all and vehemently*) : Not this Man, but Barabbas.

This we may regard as the *peripeteia*, or a sudden reversal of fortune, of the tragedy. Hereupon Pilate re-enters the hall and orders Jesus to be taken and scourged, a technical formality. The soldiers plait a crown of thorns and place it on His head, they throw a purple cloak around His shoulders and say, " Hail, King of the Jews," and they give Him blows with their hands. Then Pilate went out again, the soldiers and others following, bringing

forth Jesus arrayed in mock regal attire, and again addressed the Jews.

Pilate : Lo, I bring Him forth to you, that ye may know that I find no crime in Him.

(And as the Jews turn to look at Jesus in His strange apparel, he continues, indicating Him with a gesture)

Behold the Man.

Jews : Crucify, crucify.

Pilate : Take Him yourselves and crucify. For I find no guilt in Him.

Jews : We have a law, and by our law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God.

(Pilate, in still greater astonishment, turns to where Jesus stands surrounded by soldiers, and holds a hurried consultation with Him.)

Pilate : Whence art Thou ? (Jesus is silent.) Dost Thou not know that I have authority to release Thee and authority to crucify Thee ?

Jesus : Thou wouldest have had no authority against Me had it not been given to thee from above. Therefore he that delivered Me to thee hath the greater sin.

Pilate makes a fresh effort to procure His liberation, but the Jews finally exclaim :

" If thou wilt acquit this Man thou art not Cæsar's friend. Every one that maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar."

(Pilate withdraws for the last time and orders Jesus to be led into the Paved Hall, which was called Gabbatha in the Hebrew, perhaps from a cupola or dome over the Bema, or from the sloping formation of the ground. This was evidently a place in full view of the people, or one into which their law allowed them to pass without making themselves unfit to partake of the national feast. The addition of the Hebrew name suggests this possibility.

Then he seats himself [1] on the Bema and points to Jesus.)

Pilate: Behold your King.

Jews (*all and clamorously*): Remove, remove, crucify Him.

Pilate: Shall I crucify your King?

Jews: We have no king but Cæsar.

In this scene we remark the skill in which the proprieties [2] of the different characters are maintained. The writer does not represent Pilate as placing Jesus on the seat of justice—a most improper action—as Justin does, who, with the Gospel of St. Peter, reads, "they caused Him to sit down" (ἐκαθισαν αὐτόν), a corruption clearly of a later date, and therefore a useful piece of evidence regarding the time of the composition of the Gospel. The writer also observes consistency, τὸ ὁμαλόν, Aristotle's fourth requisite in character-drawing. The crowd behaves as a crowd, Pilate as a judge convinced of the innocence of the accused, our Lord as a King.

Pilate yields, and the scene is over. Now follows the *pathos* [3], the third part of the drama,[4] which consists, according to Aristotle, "of destructive or painful actions; the public display of death, bodily anguish, *wounds*, and such like." The writer does not, however, linger upon the harrowing details of the Crucifixion, but, as usual, selects certain minute details which add considerably to the effect of the situation. Jesus bears His own cross. He is "in the midst" even of the bandits. Compare i. 26, "In the midst of you stands One whom ye know not." The inscription on the cross is composed by Pilate and bears the name of the Man sought by the military in the Garden, "Jesus of

[1] ἐκάθισεν. This has been taken to mean that he caused Jesus to be seated thereon.
[2] τὰ ἁρμόττοντα. *Poetics*, xv.
[3] πάθος.
[4] *Poetics*, xii.

Nazareth," as well as Pilate's title, " The King of the Jews." Against this title, read by many of the Jews, the priests protest. Pilate's reply is laconic and characteristic. The garments are divided into four parts, " for each soldier a part " ; but lots are cast for the seamless coat, " woven from the top throughout." The group of watchers, no longer standing " afar off," as in Matthew and Mark, are probably emboldened by the presence of " the disciple whom Jesus loved " to stand by the Cross, and hear the sacred trust given at such an hour and in such a place, " Woman, behold thy son " . . . " Behold thy mother." The cry " I thirst," which is evidence of the physical suffering of One who is described as the Word in the Prologue, and shows that the human nature of the Son of God was not overlooked ; the stalk of hyssop with the sponge of vinegar held to His lips ; the triumphant call ; " It is finished," the bowing of the head, the request of the Jews to remove the body, the breaking of the robbers' legs, the soldiers' hesitation to break Jesus' legs because He was already dead, the piercing of His side with a spear and the outflow of blood and water, are fresh and vivid details that substantiate the claim of an eye-witness, and add point and pathos to the Passion.

In the next scene Joseph of Arimathæa—a disciple, but " a secret one for fear of the Jews," a personal touch not in the Synoptists—begs the body, and with the help of Nicodemus lays it himself in a new sepulchre, as a temporary resting-place, little witting how temporary it was. They bring a compound of myrrh and aloes—which cannot have weighed a hundredweight.[1] Two pounds were nearer the mark.

The concluding scenes, as evidences of the Resurrection, are skilfully depicted. The arrival

[1] ἕκαστον is surely to be read for ἑκατόν.

of Mary Magdalene at the tomb, her wonder at the removal of the stone, her instant return to Peter and the other disciple whom Jesus loved, who seem inseparable companions now; the race of the twain to the tomb, the first man looking in and seeing the linen clothes lying, but waiting until Peter had entered, who remarks the linen turban lying by itself, and their entering and believing; the withdrawal of the others while Mary remains weeping at the sepulchre; the appearance of Jesus, and the manner of her recognition of Him; His appearance to the eleven, the doubts of Thomas, his test of faith, his recognition of Jesus and confession, are described with a skilful and artistic pen. The Recognition[1] scene in the Garden is one of the most pathetic and realistic in all literature. It is a transcript from the life, a masterpiece from a master-hand, an idyll inimitable and touching, described with a marvellous self-restraint and simplicity.

In the Epilogue the writer allows himself more freedom. Its contents are, in a measure, outside the tragedy,[2] and it seems more or less an afterthought. Artistically it was not needed, but morally it was required to exemplify the principle

"On the earth the broken arcs; in the heaven a perfect round."

The purpose of the writer triumphs over the demands of his art. He no longer heeds that the reredos of his altar of faith may lack the superb grace and finish of that altar. For upon its panels are engraved two visions of the risen Lord—now directing the gathering of the Church Militant out of many waters to the shores of eternal life, and anon revealing

[1] Recognition (*anagnorisis*) was an important element in the Greek drama. Aristotle in his *Poetics* (ii. 16) describes various kinds of discovery such as in the *Iphigeneia*, the *Coephoræ*, and in the *Œdipus*, the best kind arising out of the action itself. In the Gospel the *anagnorisis* leads to the *peripeteia* or the crisis, but in a different way from that in the *Œdipus*. Here it leads to victory, there to humiliation. [2] ἔξω τῆς τραγωδίας (Aristotle).

Himself so touchingly, so restoringly to one of the shepherds of His sheep ; while above all is inscribed in golden letters, " Till I come." [1]

Throughout the work the *ars celandi artem* is conspicuously displayed. Every detail has point. The scenes are constructed and marshalled by one whose eye for the picturesque enabled him to sort his materials, to stereotype passing impressions with a single stroke, and whose dramatic instinct led him to grasp and arrange the *dramatis personæ* with power and effect. It has already been pointed out that the dramatic laws of Aristotle have been faithfully followed. Is it possible to doubt that the writer's evident genius for characterization and dramatization—not in the sense of creating character or inventing scenes or composing speeches, but in the sense of representing the men he had known in all their strength and weakness, their manner of speech and action, of delineating human character in all its complexity and depth, and of seizing the episodes in the Master's life which were the real turning-points in the Tragedy of the Cross—may have received its direction from an acquaintance with the Greek drama and the laws of its construction ? If we compare the scenes of the Fourth Gospel with those of the Synoptic Gospels, we find, indeed, in the latter a story, " pitiful, wondrous pitiful," but in the former we have a tragedy, real, intense, progressive. And this because it is an acute study of human character by one who combined simplicity of style with a sense of the sublime, as described in chapter V., p. 99.

Moreover, every word and occurrence contributes to the advance of the drama, at every step the tragedy grows to climax. The author had much of that sense of proportion and harmony which was peculiarly Greek. The outline of his picture is presented

[1] ἕως ἔρχομαι.

with Greek distinctness. It is filled in with Greek *naïveté*, directness, simplicity, and self-control, and the whole is rounded off with the symmetrical and pure type of workmanship which can only be paralleled in the tragedies of Sophocles. Such is the form in which the work is presented.

Judged by such internal evidence of mind and art, structure and character, the organic unity of the Gospel may be said to be established. But the purpose and spirit are transcendental and mystical. The closing words of the Gospel bring us forward beyond the limits of time while they indicate that event which is to consummate the history of the world, the *Parousia* of the Son of man. The writer's gaze is fixed on things behind the veil; his vision is of one Divine purpose, increasing through the ages and giving light to the children of men; his communings are ever with the Word, and his attitude is one of one who waits and listens for the coming of his Lord. The Gospel moves from eternity to eternity. The high level of the Prologue of the Word, who was God and who became Man, is maintained throughout. The writer is ever on the wing, and he soars like the eagle towards the sun of his existence, the Christ. And as we follow the gleaming of his golden pinions, rising grandly over the distant mountain peaks, until they are lost to sight in the measureless expanse, our eyes are drawn upwards—ever higher and higher—to contemplate and discern fresh glories and new lights in the Only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; we know of a surety that He came from the Father, and we believe that the Father did send Him; we receive the separate messages [1] which the Father hath given to the Son, and we observe the revelation of the Son, which is the Father's Word [2] in its organic completeness as the whole body of the truth.

[1] τὰ ῥήματα. [2] λόγος.

CHAPTER VIII

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ITS THOUGHT—PUBLIC DISCOURSES

THE author of the Fourth Gospel is limited, by his avowed purpose to prove that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,[1] to certain aspects of the Lord's life and work, His revelation of the Father, His revelation of Himself, and the manner in which those revelations were received by the world. With a view to trace the development of the teaching of the Word, and to illustrate the evolution of a universal kingdom from the germ of the Jewish Messiahship, he selects the incidents and characters of his story. The former are signs of the life, personality, and influence of Jesus, while the latter are types of belief and unbelief in Him. This self-imposed limitation is to a large extent responsible for the fragmentary nature of the record. But having regard to his design to describe the Incarnate One, as He revealed Himself to man, and as He was received by man, the work is a complete gospel, though not a perfect biography.

The purpose of the writer is also in a large measure responsible for the apparent monotony of the discourses, which are alleged on the one hand to be dull repetitions, without advance or progress, and on the other, are treated as the free compositions of the Evangelists. This monotony was, however, almost as inevitable as the freedom of treatment, considering that it was a specific presentation of the Christ that we have here, but such a presentation as the subjectivity of a soul disciplined and developed by the Master Himself alone could give. The discourses, therefore, bear the impress of a strong

[1] xx. 31.

individuality, but that of one who sought to give variety to thought and movement in dialogue, which revealed the minds and souls of the *dramatis personæ* more completely than the narrative could have done, and in which our Lord's own utterances receive a special distinction. A slight variation is also gained by the fact that the diction of the Master is to some extent different from that of his biographer, showing that the Evangelist made an attempt to preserve the words of Jesus in a suitable form. The writer handles his theme in a dramatic manner, and his purpose is dramatically attained. For the scheme of the Gospel is dramatic, and the advance of its revelation like the progressive illumination that a great drama gives of its leading characters.

As the dialogue advances, as the speakers pass and repass before us, and as new arrivals are announced, the stage seems to become thronged with figures, more or less interested, more or less hostile, until at last the tragedy of the death and the glory of the Resurrection, foreshadowed in the remarkable sentence after the purification of the Temple, is accomplished, and the life and light and love of God press for a more spiritual and intimate connection with the souls of men.

Writing at a distant date from the events he describes and the words he records, the Evangelist must have experienced considerable difficulty in distinguishing his reminiscences of the Master's words and actions from his own interpretation of those words and action. But from his few attempts to comment *in propria persona* upon those words, *e.g.*, ii. 21, "But He spake of the temple of His body," and xii. 33, "This He said, signifying what death He should die," we have proof how far the soul of the disciple was inferior to that of his Master, and that the disciple owes his ideal elevation and spiritual form to personal communion with a

superhuman being, whom he described as "the Christ, the Son of God," and in whom his soul still continued to find its light and love and liberty. The presence of the Master is ever the inspiration of the disciple. It is true that in places the story goes somewhat tamely, and the dialogue moves tardily, but yet both are full of point and verve if read, not as narrative, but as drama. In fact, the critical junctures in the life, the interesting conversations and soliloquies, and the constant alternation of thought and speech render it, as we have seen, a simple matter to cast the Gospel into the form of a drama.

This arrangement of the work is the best refutation of the partition theories which have been put forward by Dr. C. A. Briggs and Dr. H. H. Wendt and others, and would help to clear up certain phenomena of the Gospel, such as the anticipated confessions, the foreshortening of the process by which faith was attained, and the fact that we can almost see the end from the very beginning, for which Canon Sanday would find an explanation in the fact that "in looking back over a distant past it is always difficult to keep the true perspective." But this foreshortening of the processes and the anticipation of the confessions of the faith, if not literally exact from an historical point of view, are distinctly effective from the dramatic standpoint. For the shadow of the tragic finale in every great tragedy lieth upon the opening scenes in the form of some cloud upon the horizon, perhaps no bigger than a man's hand.

The general effect is that the discourses of the Gospel flow steadily forward with increasing interest and deepening revelation like the onward course of a river, the smoothness of whose current is ever and anon disturbed by a cataract, where its placidity is for the moment broken, but its strength is enhanced,

until it finally blends its waters with the great deep. The author seems to have had the poetic instinct of representing the discourses in their true connection and environment. He also appears to have known that

> "Many things by season seasoned are
> To their right praise and true perfection,"

for each discourse deals with a special topic, and was called forth by special circumstances. In the Synoptic narratives we have, generally speaking, average examples of the popular teaching of the Master, but here we find special types which present successively fresh aspects of the Christ and His work, and have reference to the particular lessons of the great occasions on which they were given. This is specially noticeable in the addresses delivered on those festivals which marked crises in the history of the Jewish people. We find here an internal correspondence of thought between the discourses and their historical setting which is of profound interest. For instance, the Passover thought of the Bread of Life embodied in the Feast of Unleavened Bread and its harvest expectations is the substance of the discourse in the sixth chapter, upon which the miracle of loaves also throws light. The discourse on the water of life, the leading idea of the seventh chapter, may be taken in connexion with the drawing of water by the priest on the Feast of Tabernacles. And so with each of the others. There is a similar psychological connection between the aspirations and the associations of the dialogues, the majority of which belong to the Judæan ministry, and are shaped by our Lord's actual environment. Nicodemus, for example, comes to Jesus "by *night*," and the Master brought the discourse round to *light*. "But this is the judgment, that Light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds

were evil." [1] The Samaritan woman cometh to the well to draw water, and the Master speaks of the "well of water springing up to eternal life." [2] What may seem unnecessary repetition in dialogue and discourse is, therefore, largely due to the Master's habit of presenting the central thought in different lights and illustrating it by different figures, as occasion offers. There is nothing strained or abrupt, however. The dialogues flow onward with an even tenor, and, placid as they are, find redemption from the commonplace in the uncommon nature and singular beauty of the Master's mind.

Moreover, there is a systematic arrangement in the discourses. They are clearly conversations given in précis, abstracts intelligently made, and not unnecessarily elaborated, by one who beheld the truth in its proper perspective, who saw the mind of Christ, and saw it whole. This fact might account in some degree for the appearance of sameness in the speeches, which are charged with lack of individuality, and also serve to dissipate the charge of free interpretation which has been made against the Apostle. For it is the presentation of the truth concerning Christ, not given by one who looked at Him from a distance, but who ever carried Him in his heart of hearts, that we have in this Gospel. The teaching of the Master has already become his experience, after its different parts had fallen into their proper positions with regard to the whole, and a perfect temple of truth had been erected, duly ordered and proportioned, to harmonize with the central structure, the Person of the Word made flesh—the principal thought of the Gospel. All this, as we shall see, implies arrangement and development.

Furthermore, in the self-revelation of Jesus there is historic development, orderly progress. His

[1] iii. 19. [2] iv. 14.

Messianic consciousness followed a natural order of advance, and His revelation of Himself to man followed a parallel order. For He only revealed the Father and Himself to men as they were able to bear it. Seven times He revealed Himself with the words "I am." But these declarations, though apparently casual, fragmentary, and incidental in their origin and nature, serve to supplement each other, and all together combine to form a perfect harmony of thought, an ordered progress of Divine glimpses of the wondrous Personality of the Christ. "I am the Bread of Life," "I am the Light of the World," "I am the Door of the sheep," "I am the Good Shepherd," "I am the Resurrection and the Life," "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," and "I am the True Vine." Each of these seven rays thus focussed upon that Divine life throws a light upon some permanent characteristic of the Christ, some feature of His nature, some trait of His character that endears Him to His children. Under the simple types of bread, light, door, way, shepherd, and vine they illustrate some one immortal aspect of the truth in Christ, and under a passing attribute describe an enduring principle. They each have their part in the economy of life and combine to unfold its philosophy in a consummate order and harmony of love and grace, of power and life, of wisdom and goodness and beauty. As the seven words of the Cross express the mystery of His Death and Passion, so these seven words proclaim the majesty of His life and power. They set forth the seven eternal principles that go to the making up of the Christian character. The more they are studied, the more glimpses they give of the Divine nature of Christ, the more light they throw upon the dark passages and difficult problems of life. For they reveal the strands of human life gathered up in a hand—pierced but powerful—that knoweth to

rule and guide with the sympathetic touch of a Son of man who was also Son of God.

We are thus prepared to find in this Gospel a riper and more progressive revelation of the Personality of Christ and of His Kingdom which is eternal life. Jesus does not here claim the title of Messiah, but He claims infinitely higher honours. He reveals Himself in His unique relation to the Father, first in His discourses to the world, and then in His words to His inner band of disciples in the upper room and after. He is the Son of the Father in a sense in which no one else ever was. The uniqueness of that relation is that it is not merely one of perfection, but also one of participation and purpose.[1]

This relation the Master does not transfer to His disciples, although through it they and we are children [2] of God. He is *par excellence* and in His Divinity the Only-begotten Son of God, and through Him, who is the Father's own [3] Son, we have the potent privilege [4] of being made children of God, being begotten, not of flesh and blood, nor of the will of men, but of God.[5] Thus we have in Christ the archetype of all filial relationship to God, and through Him we have the privilege of participation to a certain degree in that relation. Thus participation is expressed under the figure of a new birth, a birth from above of water and Spirit. For it denotes the relationship of a life which is spiritual and eternal to the life of humanity, and which is further set forth in the revelations of the discourses, "I am the Resurrection and the Life," "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," "He that believeth on Me hath eternal life."

[1] viii. 29: "My doctrine is not Mine, but His that sent Me;" viii. 42: "I came forth and am come from God;" x. 30: "I and the Father are One."

[2] τέκνα. [3] ἴδιος. [4] ἐξουσία.

[5] i. 19–13. *Cf.* 1 Peter i. 23: "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the Word of God, who liveth and abideth for ever."

The Master especially revealed His sonship in the Father and His relation to men under His favourite designations "Son of God" and "Son of man." Generally speaking, whenever He desired to refer to His unique relation to the Father, whenever He wished to emphasize that relation, or whenever He required to dwell upon His pre-existent state, His Divine glory, and His mission, He spoke of Himself as the Son of God. As the Son of God He offered Himself to faith. As the Son of God He speaks of Himself in connection with the resurrection of the dead. As the Son of God He declares His Divine mission and consecration; as the Son of God—the Son who stood in a unique relation to the Father—He was well qualified to act as His messenger, to reveal His Name, and to declare His purpose to men. That revelation was His peculiar possession. He only, who understood the Father, could make Him known to man. As the Son of God, He is the heir to the Father's throne. He has everything, and through Him everything is given. This relation of Jesus to the Father is His permanent possession. It cannot be passed on or transmitted, because it is so intimately connected with His very personality that He cannot think of Himself apart from it. Through that relation the Father dwelleth in Him. "Believe Me that I am in the Father and the Father in Me." As the Son of God the life of Jesus was the eternal expression of the universal fatherhood of God and spiritual sonship in Him. He has taught men to love the Father and to honour the Father. Thus He represents God to man, showing how true and loving, glorious and gracious that Father is, winning men to love Him and to trust Him for Himself, and not for His works and gifts: a true Son of a true Father.

But when He chose to emphasize His humanity and His relations to men, He called Himself the

Son of man. In many of the passages where this title is used there is an anticipation of His death and glory. The constant refrain of this discourse in the Fourth Gospel is, "The Son of man must be lifted up." We hear it in the interview with Nicodemus,[1] in the address to the Jews in the Temple,[2] in that solemn prediction after the visit of the Greeks,[3] and as Judas left the room in order to accomplish His death.[4] As Son of man, He was removed from the earth for man. As Son of man, He is able to give us life, to help us to share in the virtues of His risen and glorified humanity. As Son of man, the Father hath given Him authority to judge.[5]

In all His relations with man He is Son of man, as in all His relations with God He is Son of God. Therefore He said to Nathanael, "Hereafter shall ye see the heavens opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." That is, you shall find in My humanity an altar stairs that slope to heaven, a ladder reaching unto the skies, upon which the messengers of God ascend and descend. As Son of man, He is our representative to the Father. In Him God sees us, and God accepts us. As Son of man, He is our ideal of man, and His sufferings and trials had reality. As Son of man, He understands and has pity for sinners. Therefore He can save them: therefore He is qualified to judge them. And as the Son of God He is the representative of the Father to man, He is His consecrated messenger, He is the heaven-sent revealer of the Father and the Divine heir. The two titles thus supplement each other, and together combine to express the human tenderness and the Divine truth in the Son of God, who became the Son of man to make the sons of men sons of God.

In this revelation of Himself—His own personality, which is deeper and higher than human thought,

[1] iii. 14. [2] viii. 28. [3] xii. 32. [4] xiv. 31. [5] v. 37.

more sublime than aught the world hath yet seen, more enduring than the forces of time—is involved another revelation, that of His Kingdom, or that sphere of life and truth in which His Spirit rules. The writer of the Fourth Gospel expressly excludes an earthly sovereignty from the programme of his Master.[1] Standing before Pilate, He declared that His Kingdom was "the truth."[2] In this revelation of the Kingdom we notice a marked advance beyond the positions of the Synoptists. Of the first three Gospels the Kingdom of God is the keynote. In the Fourth it is twice mentioned in the discourse with Nicodemus; but in its place we have "eternal life,"[3] which occurs sixteen times. For, as our Lord informs Nicodemus, the Kingdom of God is the realm of life. It is the region of things where God and His righteousness are the ruling and living principles. For His commandment[4] or that which He accomplishes through Me is eternal life.[5] In that Kingdom there is life and salvation. The Kingdom begins, as life begins, in the gift of the Maker.[6] It starts into being at the will of the Divine.[7] It develops new forms, discovers new powers, and, like the seed, is charged with the future.[8] And that life is indestructible, eternal, and universal, spreading unto the utmost limits of humanity. For it has intensive self-developing force and extensive evolutionary energy. This Kingdom is a life to be entered and realised in Christ. The word for salvation in the Fourth Gospel is *life*. "I am come that they may have life, and that they may have abundance." He that believeth on the Son hath life. The

[1] v. 15. [2] xviii. 37. [3] ζωὴ αἰώνιος.

[4] This seems to be the meaning of ἐντολή here. The Apostle views the law of life in its actual fulfilment and consummation, so that the word of the Master signify: "It is my experience that His will is life eternal, that what He consummates and realizes through Me is eternal life."

[5] xii. 50. [6] iii. 16. [7] iii. 3. [8] xii. 24.

Son is the real principle of growth and development in the Kingdom of God. "I am the Door; through Me if any man enter, He shall be saved" —or "he shall have life" (so Syriac)—"and shall go in and out and find pasture."[1] All that St. Paul meant by the Divine gifts of justification, sanctification, and adoption, and all that he signified by the human experiences of faith, hope, and love, is covered by this word "life," which implies both the birth from above, or of the Spirit, by which man enters into the Kingdom, and the faith within the soul, by which it draws nigh to Him, is convicted of sin and receives the light. It embraces all that Christ has done for man, and all that He doth in man. For the Lamb of God, "who taketh away the sin of the world," is also the Life of the world. This self-revelation was given in outline to the world, but was more fully explained and developed in His communings with believers in the upper room and after. There we have a fuller revelation of that spiritual life which is the gift of Christ through the Holy Spirit. That teaching, however, was for those who could receive it. To such that Divine Spirit is especially revealed, and as He is revealed He becomes the representative of the Master in the hearts of men.

CHAPTER IX

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ITS THOUGHT—PRIVATE DISCOURSES

IN the public discourses of Jesus we have His self-revelation to the world; but in His private conversations, better known as His last discourses, we find His self-revelation to His disciples. These mysterious addresses, which take the place of the

[1] x. 9.

eschatological discourses, can only be interpreted on the principle of development. By Renan, who trusted the narrative but disliked the discourses of this Gospel, they are included in the sweeping condemnation—

"The ideas, above all, are of an order entirely different from those in the other books of the New Testament. We are here in full Philonian and almost Gnostic metaphysics. The discourses of Jesus, as reported by this pretended witness, are false, often insipid and impossible."

On the contrary, if we follow the principle of interpretation laid down above, we shall find that the subjects are clearly marshalled, the matter orderly arranged, and the thought naturally developed. Nor would it be impossible for a Jew of tenacious memory to reproduce such discourses in after-years in an abridged form. These discourses fall into two groups, the conversation in the upper room, which includes xiii., 33–xiv., and the conversation on the way to Gethsemane, which is contained in chapters xv. and xvi., but these groups mutually supplement each other. Of the discourses in the upper room the coming separation, its cause and its consequences, is the theme, and of the second discourse union, its conditions and consummation, is the text. These themes are appropriate and appropriately approached and developed. And interwoven with the very fabric of the discourses are three topics of transcendent interest, the relations of the Father and the Son, the Paraclete and the disciples, the world and the Church, the treatment of which shows similar progress.

The hour of departure is at hand. The Saviour is yet a little while with the disciples. He improves the occasion by impressing upon their minds what that departure means for Himself and for them. In the season of separation from their Master they

must be united with one another, so that their union may be an object-lesson to the world. "A new commandment give I unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another." United in their love of Him, they should be led to closer union with each other, so that the world might say, "Behold how these Christians love one another." A disciple, Peter, asks, "Whither goest Thou?" and is told that he cannot follow now, but afterwards will follow; when he has learned to trust his own self-confidence less and Christ more. "Let not your heart be alarmed. Believe in God, and believe in Me. For I leave you but to prepare a place for you. I will come again and receive you unto Myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." A temporary separation is necessary. For the Saviour it meant closer union with the Father—"because I go unto the Father"; a greater revelation of His own Name to His disciples —"Whatsoever ye shall ask in My Name I will do"; and the increased glory of the Father—"that the Father may be glorified in the Son." And for the disciples it meant a closer union with one another, a place prepared in the Father's Home, the laying down of a new way to the Father's heart—"I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life; no man cometh unto the Father but by Me"—the fulfilment of their prayers in His Name; the mission of a second Comforter, the Spirit of Truth—"who dwelleth with them and shall be in them"; the manifestation of Jesus—"He that loveth Me shall be loved of My Father, and I will love him and will manifest Myself to him"; the permanent union of the Father and the Son with the obedient—"If a man love Me he will keep My words, and My Father will love him; and We will come unto him and make Our abode with him;" fuller instruction of the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, who shall bring all things to their

remembrance ; and finally the peace of the Saviour given spontaneously and liberally, the crowning gift, and the comfortable hope of His return with greater power—" Ye should rejoice if ye loved Me, because I said, ' I go to My Father,' for My Father is greater than I." He must leave His temporary tabernacle—the symbol of the world—in order to prepare a grander shrine for Himself—even the Church, His body, the symbol of heaven.

Such is a summary of the discourse in the upper room. The topics are such as might naturally be the subject of the thoughts and words of the Word made flesh. But as they are still somewhat abstruse and remote from the understanding of His disciples, He brings them back to the coming crisis in their life by words that the future shall interpret and the Spirit shall keep alive in their memories. In conclusion, He says, " My words must now be brief. For the ruler of this world cometh, and in Me hath nothing : but I must leave you, that the world may know that I love the Father, and that it is for the accomplishment of the Father's will that I so do." [1] The ellipsis is natural and pathetic. The verb omitted is doubtless one of separation. That separation is a painful chord to dwell upon, and the means whereby it is to be effected fills the Saviour with emotion, but controlling His feelings and voice with a supreme effort, He says, " Arise, let us go hence."

After these words the Master left the upper room, followed by His disciples. The discourse that ensued was delivered on the way to Gethsemane, and was concluded before they had entered the Garden. As the thought of the discourse just finished was separation, that of this discourse is union, the spiritual union of believers in their absent Lord, and the spiritual union of believers with one another, consummated with joy and triumph after

[1] xiv. 30.

much sorrow, separation, and failure. The transition was a natural one. Physical separation was necessary to complete the spiritual union of the Master and His people. He now speaks as One who has left the disciples in the body to draw near to them in spirit. The conditions and the consummation of such a union are the topics of this crowning discourse. "I am the true Vine, and My Father is the Husbandman"; that is, the Father ordains the conditions of the new Spiritual life. He trains and disciplines and purifies the corporate life in Christ so that it may be fruitful and prosper. For apart from Christ there is no life and no fruit. And the joy and glory of the Husbandman are guaranteed when the branches of the Vine are fruitful. He, therefore, beseeches the disciples to continue in His love and in their love of one another. His love for them is to be the inspiration and the measure of their love for one another. "This is My commandment, 'That ye love one another, as I have loved you.'" Forget not, then, that I have given you My love, that I have made known to you all that I have heard of My Father, that it was I who selected and appointed you that your efforts and desires in My cause might be crowned with success in My Person, and be united with one another, 'love one another.' The world will hate you oppose and thwart you as it hated and persecuted Me, your Master, gratuitously and without a cause. That hatred arises from ignorance of God. But when the Advocate shall come, even the Spirit of Truth, whom I shall send from the Father, He shall bear witness of Me, and ye also bear witness because ye have been with Me from the first. Thus shall your Master be vindicated and the world's opposition be broken down by the witness of the disciples united in the Master's love. These words of comfort forget not in the hour of trial and persecution

that is coming upon you, when you shall encounter opposition, when you shall be driven from the synagogues, when to murder you shall be counted a religious act. I did not speak to you of these things at the beginning of My mission, because I was with you. But now I go to Him that sent Me. And you are speechless and overcome with sorrow because I have said these things unto you. But it is indeed and in truth expedient for you that I should depart. For my departure is the condition of the coming of the Paraclete. If I go not, He will not come. But if I depart I shall send Him. And He shall not only vindicate Me and bear witness of Me, He shall also convince the world of the three facts —sin, righteousness, and judgment: of sin, because of its unbelief; of righteousness, because of My glorification; of judgment, because the final sentence of failure has already been pronounced upon the efforts of its ruling spirit. I have many things still to tell you, but you have not the strength to bear them now. But by the providential leading of the Spirit, you shall be guided into the knowledge of all the truth, and He shall show you things to come. As I have glorified My Father, He shall glorify Me. As I have taken of the Father to reveal to you, so He receiveth of Mine and shall show it unto you. His work will soon become apparent to you. For He shall create your vision of the Christ. 'A little while, and ye behold Me no more, and again a little, and ye shall see Me.' Contemplation shall then be transfigured into vision."

This is the sense in which He shall return to them. For it was the Holy Spirit who revealed the glorified Christ and His spiritual presence to the disciples. But they did not as yet comprehend the drift of His remarks. They had been saddened beyond words by the prophecy of His withdrawal from them; they are now greatly perplexed by the twice-repeated

" little while." What is the meaning of this interval ? " A little while, and ye shall not see Me ; and again a little while, and ye shall see Me." They were, therefore, naturally desirous to ask Him to explain these words. And He sought to make His meaning clearer to them by using the illustration of a woman in travail. Similarly must they have sorrow first, but afterwards their sorrow will be turned into joy. Then they shall remember no more the sorrow for the joy that they are united with their Lord—a joy that shall never be taken from them. And then they shall ask no more questions, for all things shall be made clear to them. And as to their petitions, whatsoever they shall ask the Father in His Name, the Father will give it in His Name. So far they have asked nothing in His Name. Let them ask, and they shall receive, and their joy shall be fulfilled. These things have been hitherto veiled in figures. But the hour cometh when He shall speak freely to them about the Father. In that day of knowledge their prayers shall be fuller, more complete, because sent up in the Son's Name ; not that He refers to His own personal intercession on their behalf, for the Father Himself loveth them because they have loved Him and believed in His mission from the Father. " From the Father I came," He declares, " and to the Father I return."

The minds of the disciples are reassured by these words. They gain a fresh confidence in the Saviour's mission and a fresh insight into His wisdom. " See, now Thou speakest freely," they say ; " now we are assured that Thou knowest all things and needest not that any should question Thee. By this we believe that Thou camest forth from God." " Do you now believe ? " said He. " Lo, the hour cometh, yes, is now come, when ye shall be scattered, each man to his own, and shall leave Me alone. And I am not alone, for the Father is with Me. These things have I spoken unto you, that in Me ye may have peace.

In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer ; I have overcome the world." So there shall be joy after sorrow, vision after separation, peace after warfare, and victory after failure, because they shall be spiritually reunited with their Lord.

Such are the predominant thoughts of this wonderful address. They are orderly arranged, skilfully managed, and presented in advancing stages. But there are other topics which belong to the sum and substance of the discourse, and which present a similar development. They are like the threads of one and the same material. Woven throughout, and by the same loom, they cannot be drawn out without affecting the unity and effect of the whole fabric. Such topics delicately touched, like many chords of music answering to a master hand, are blended into one harmonious whole. Among such topics are the commandment of love, already alluded to, the relations of the Father and the Son, of the Son and the disciples, of the Paraclete and the world, and the departure and the coming of the Christ. The very effort to follow one of these threads exclusively seems a courting of failure. For all are so interwoven with one another and the texture of the discourse that to disengage one from the rest were almost to unravel the whole piece. And yet if we can succeed in following any one of these threads with a reverent hand, we shall find that it leads us onward from revelation to revelation, from glory to glory, and that it thus forms a clue to the reading and understanding of the words that " are spirit and are life."

The warp on which the discourse is woven is the love of Christ for men. This is the foundation, the measure, and the motive of man's love for man, and is the true pattern of the relation of man to man. This new principle of love is inculcated in successive forms. " A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another ; as I have

loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another." [1] Brotherly love is thus enjoined upon the disciples of Christ as a sign of discipleship. "If ye love Me, ye will keep My commandments." [2] For obedience is the logical outcome, the practical aspect of love.[3] And thus the love of the disciples for Him shall be rewarded with the love of the Father and the vision of Himself.

In this saying is comprehended the answer to the question of Judas, "Lord, how happens it that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us, and not unto the world?" [4] for that manifestation is only given to love and obedience. Nor is it temporary, but lasting. It is a coming of Himself and His Father and an abiding. "We shall make Our abode with him." "He that loveth Me not, keepeth not My sayings nor My Father's words." "Hereafter I will not talk much with you, for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me. But that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave Me commandment, so I do." [5] "My obedience to the Father is a proof of My love for Him, and is a witness of Our love for the world. As the Father hath loved Me, so have I loved you: continue ye in My love. If ye keep My commandments ye shall abide in My love, even as I have kept My Father's commandments and abide in His love. This is My commandment, that ye love one another." The relation of the Father to the Son is thus the prototype of the relation of the Son to the believers, and the relation of the believers to Christ is prefigured in the relation of the Son to the Father. As the Father's love is the atmosphere of the Son's life, the Son's love is the environment of the disciples' life. "If ye shall keep My commandments, ye shall abide in My love" [6]—in the love that is Mine,

[1] xiii. 34. [2] xiv. 15. [3] xiv. 23.
[4] xiv. 32. [5] xiv. 30, 31. [6] xv. 10.

characteristic of Me, and emanating from Me. "These things have I spoken unto you, that the joy that is Mine may remain in you, and that My joy may be fulfilled."[1] The connexion between the Saviour's love[2] and the Saviour's joy[3] is deep and fast. The joy that is characteristic of Him is the serene gladness of complete self-surrender, of perfect obedience to the Father. It is love consummated in trust, the sense of having fulfilled the Father's will, the bliss of living in the sunshine of a Father's love. "If ye," He says, "have something of this joy, this χαρά, this sweet contentment of soul, this happiness of service, this serenity of life that abides, then your joy shall indeed be perfect. It will be your supreme rapture to love and be loved. It will be your greatest felicity to obey. And the Commandment that I give unto you, the Commandment characteristic of Me is that ye love one another, as I have loved you," in the same measure, with the same spontaneity, and with the same freedom. "Thus shall ye abide in My commandment, My love, and My joy."[4] The summary of this discourse of love so appropriately recorded by the beloved disciple is given in the seventeenth and following verses. "These things I command you, that ye love one another. The world hateth you because ye are not of the world, because I have chosen you out of the world." The disciples' love for each other is strongly contrasted with the world and its hate. For in their love for one another they will give a practical evidence of their Christianity, which will also be their strength and consolation in the times of hate-begotten persecutions. Such is the thread of love in the Master's last discourse.

Another topic conspicuous among others is the unique relation of the Father to the Son and of the Son to the Father. It also moves forward. And our sonship in the Father is duly based upon that

[1] xv. 11. [2] ἀγάπη [3] χαρά. [4] xv. 12.

relation. In His Father's house are many mansions. He goes to prepare a place for them ;[1] by Him man cometh to the Father,[2] if they had known Him they had known the Father also, and from henceforth they know Him and have seen Him.[3] He is in the Father, and the Father in Him. The words He utters He speaks not of Himself, and the Father, who is in Him, doeth the works. He that believes on Him shall do such works and greater, because He goes to His Father. Whatsoever they shall ask in His Name He will do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. He will not leave them orphans. He shall return to them, and then they shall know that He is in the Father, and they in Him and He in them. He that loveth Him shall be loved of His Father, and if a man love Him he will keep His words, and His Father will love him, and They will come to him and make Their abode with him. If they loved Him they would rejoice, because He said, "I go unto My Father, for My Father is greater than I." It is in obedience to the Father's will and to show the world that He loves the Father that He acts thus.[4]

On the way to the Garden the Saviour takes up the same parable, and manifests the Father as the Husbandman who exercises discipline upon the branches of the Vine, the fertility of which is the glory of the Father, and upon which the Son pours out his love with the ungrudging nature of the Father, who has given the Spirit without measure to the Son and loveth the Son. But they must obey as the Son obeys the Father. The greatest sign of love is to die for one's friend. And they are His friends if they obey Him. He has treated them as friends and chosen them that they should bear permanent fruit. The world hates and persecutes because it knows not the Father. For he that hateth

[1] xiv. 1–2. [2] xiv. 6 [3] xvi. 7.
[4] xiv. 9–13. [5] iii. 35.

Him hateth His Father. All things that the Father hath are His. The Comforter proceedeth from the Father, and will be sent at the Son's request. These things He has spoken unto them in figures, but the hour cometh when He shall no more speak so, but shall plainly reveal the Father. In that day they shall ask in His Name, and they shall not need His intercession, for the Father loves them because they have loved and believed that the Son came forth from God.[1]

Such is the great promise and revelation of the Father. But from that inspiring vision the soul of the Saviour is recalled to the dread facts of the present, yet as He replies to the Apostles' confession of faith He discloses both their immediate, though temporary, dismay and the ancient and constant source of His own serenity. "And I am not alone, for the Father is with Me."[2] Such is the relation of the Father and the Son, profound and mystical, as it is revealed in this Gospel.

In the revelation of the Holy Spirit, the Advocate, another thread of this lofty discourse, there is also due progression. This is but natural in a Gospel which is essentially concerned with the things of the Spirit and which teaches that the Spirit descended and took up His abode[3] upon Christ;[4] that it was He who should baptize in the Spirit[5]; that man must be born from above[6] by that spiritual influence which is, like the wind, invisible and incalculable, but no less real and potent[7]; that the Spirit was not given in measured quantities to the Son,[8] but that "the Spirit was not yet (*i.e.* in actual possession) because Jesus was not yet glorified."[9] This teaching is repeated in different forms and presented in different aspects, but all the time we are being

[1] xvi. 3–28. [2] xvi., 32.

[3] Ambrose remarks that the Spirit inspired a saying and acted upon the prophets, but *abode* upon Christ.

[4] ἔμεινεν. i. 34. [5] i. 32. [6] ἄνωθεν.

[7] iii. 8. [8] vi. 35. [9] vii. 39.

carried forward to some new conception so that there is coherence and development. To the teacher of Israel Jesus spoke of the spiritual birth,[1] to the woman of Samaria of the spiritual nature and worship of God,[2] to His disciples of the "Spirit that giveth life," [3] and to the Jews at the Feast of Tabernacles of the Spirit which they who believe on Him should receive.[4] But in these discourses Jesus reveals more fully the Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit, who should be His representative and their instructor and consoler. His relation to the Apostles, which dates its commencement from their union with the Master, shall then be of a more intimate nature. "If ye love Me, ye will keep My commandments: and I shall ask the Father, and He will give you another Comforter, that He may abide with [5] you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth, . . . whom ye know, for He abideth *by* you,[6] and shall be *in* you." [7] There are thus three stages in this relationship of the Spirit and the disciples distinctly marked by the Greek prepositions, each of which denotes a closer union than its predecessor. A similar development can be traced in the relation between the Son and the Spirit. "He (the Father) shall give you another Comforter"; [8] "I will send Him unto you"; [9] "I will not leave you orphans; I come to you," *i.e.* in the person of the Spirit. The Father's messenger becomes the Son's envoy and the Son's representative. The mission of this Divine agent, whose Personality is distinctly implied in His office, is a permanent and abiding one. He is the gift of the Father, given at the Son's request to those who love Him and keep His commandments. Love and obedience are the conditions of His coming. As our first Advocate Christ has pleaded the cause of man against the adversary of the race, the other

[1] iii. 5.
[2] iv. 24.
[3] vi. 63.
[4] vii. 39.
[5] μεθ' ὑμῶν.
[6] παρ ὑμῖν.
[7] ἐν ὑμῖν.
[8] xiv. 16.
[9] xvi. 7.

Advocate will plead the cause of Christ's Church against the world. For He is the Spirit of Truth, the Spirit who inspires man to seek the truth, who establishes the Truth as it is in Christ, and whose function it is not merely to convict the world, but also to declare and spread the truth in the world through the Church and to lead the Church of Christ into all the truth. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now. But when He, the Spirit of Truth, shall come, He will lead you into all truth. For He shall not speak of Himself, but as many things as He shall hear He shall speak, and He will show you things to come." [1] For there is to be a gradual and progressive revelation of Divine truth to the Church, which will enable it to apply the principles of Christ to the varying and multiplying problems of its generations and to realize the fulness of the truth in Him. And the Church as a body duly received the gift of this Spirit when the risen Christ in His spiritualized body appeared to the disciples, gave them a definite commission parallel to His own, and symbolizing His gift by a definite physical action, said, "Take ye a Holy Spirit," [2] and gave them therewith the power of dealing with sin and of admitting men to the sacred privileges of His body.

Again, the constantly recurring refrain of the address is the departure and return of the Christ which is so intimately connected and identified with the coming of the Holy Spirit. "Whither I go ye cannot come;" [3] "I go to prepare a place for you;" [4] "I shall come again and receive you unto Myself;" [5] "Greater works than these shall He do, because I go to My Father;" [6] "I shall not leave you orphans, I come to you;" [7] "A little while, and ye shall not see Me; and again a little while, and ye shall see Me;" [8] "But I will see you again

[1] xvi. 13. [2] xx. 23. [3] xiii. 53. [4] xiv. 2.
[5] xiv. 3. [6] xiv. 11. [7] xiv. 18. [8] xvi. 16.

and your heart shall rejoice;"[1] "I came forth from the Father and came unto the world, again I leave the world and go unto My Father."[2] In these last words our Lord sums up the great facts of His Life, as the Word who was in the beginning with God, who became flesh, who was crucified, dead and buried, and who rose again, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father.

The return of Christ to the world forms another thread, woven so cunningly into the texture of the discourse that it is difficult to follow it in all its windings. But it, too, shows development. The very word for world[3] gradually acquires a more sinister sense as the Gospel proceeds. The world is made by the Word, but did not know the Light.[4] God's love for the world was the cause of the coming of the Son, who was sent, not to judge the world, but that the world through Him might be saved.[5] But this is the judgment,[6] that the Light has come into the world, but that men shrank from the Light and preferred darkness.[7] Jesus is still "the Light of the world;"[8] but the world's hostility becomes more active, and its hate is gathered up in its ruler. "Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the prince of this world be cast out."[9] The world is unable to receive the Spirit, because it lacks the spiritual power to discern and recognize Him.[10] The world loveth not Christ, nor keepeth His words; therefore it cannot receive His manifestation.[11] His gift is not like the gifts of the world.[12] The prince of this world is powerless against the Christ, who only submits in order that His love for the Father may be known.[13] The world hates the Master, and hates the disciples because they have been chosen out of it;[14] and will show

[1] xvii. 28. [2] xvi. 28. [3] κόσμος. [4] i. 10.
[5] iii. 17. [6] κρίσις. [7] iii. 20. [8] viii. 12.
[9] xii. 31. [10] xiv. 17. [11] xiv. 22. [12] xiv. 26.
[13] xiv. 31. [14] xv. 18.

its malign hostility and criminal ignorance in cruel persecution,[1] but will at last be convicted by the Holy Spirit in the minds of all good men of having fallen into sin, of having failed to appreciate righteousness, and of having deserved its sentence.[2] At their sorrows the world shall rejoice; in the world they shall have trouble; but let them take heart, for He has overcome the world.[3]

In that wonderful soliloquy, the Consecration Prayer, which follows, these teachings are transformed into Divine aspirations. The mood of the Saviour is exalted. It was a "lightning before death," an ecstasy produced by the sense of past achievement and impending catastrophe. A refined rapture thrills through His words. The consciousness of having glorified the Father, of having finished His work, of having overcome the world, of having kept together by His truth the family He had been given to found, produced that exalted mood. Then the Son, in perfect fellowship with His Heavenly Father, lifted up His eyes to heaven, and prayed that Father to manifest the true nature of the Son, so that the Son might reveal the Fatherhood of God to the world through His Church, and that the world might believe in the Divine mission and universal authority of the Son, which is eternal life. The original glory of the Father and the Son, the Father's protection of the Son's disciples and the world's hatred of them, their share in the Saviour's joy, their consecration through the Father's truth and the Son's sacrifice, the unity of the Father and the Son, the unity and perfection of the disciples, the Son's mission and the Father's love, the disciples' vision of the Son's glory, knowledge of the Father's Name and experience of the Father's love—these are the thoughts which are woven into the texture of this sublime supplication. With indescribable pathos the Saviour speaks of

[1] xvi. 1–4. [2] xvi. 8–12. [3] xvi. 33.

the Father's glory, truth, and love, of His own power and mission, gift and glory, joy and consecration; of the disciples' danger and deliverance, unity and perfection, testimony and reward, and of the world's hostility and conversion. Wonderfully appropriate and real at such a time was such a prayer. Lofty and tender beyond words is the soul therein reflected, with its Divine devotion to the Holy Father's Name, with its unspeakable yearning for those who loved Him, with its profound pity for the world which had rejected Him.

The substance of this prayer is found in that recorded in St. Matthew's Gospel,[1] and many of its thoughts are echoes of the discourses and confessions that have gone before. Of this sublime and spontaneous utterance, which resembles in its structure the Pindaric ode, the Father's glory might be described as the beginning; the Father's truth as the centre, and the Father's love as the crown. For the heart of the prayer is the Father's truth.

> "Sanctify them in Thy truth;
> Thy word is Truth;
> And on their behalf I sanctify Myself,
> That they may be sanctified in Truth." [2]

This is the solitary reference in the prayer to the work of the promised Advocate, the Spirit of Truth, who proceedeth from the Father,[3] but that it is not the least prominent thought is proved by the fact that it is the subject of the Lord's conversation on the following morn with Pilate.[4] "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I might bear witness to the truth. Every one who is of the truth heareth My voice." Pilate said, "What is truth?" Thus the prayer stands midway between the discourse on the way and the discourse in Pilate's hall, intimately connected with both.

As we follow up these threads, these separate

[1] xi. 25–30. [2] xvii. 17–19. [3] xv. 26. [4] xix. 37–38.

utterances of Christ in a devotional hour, we observe how they are being gradually and orderly woven into one great fabric of infinite value and wonderful texture, even the Father's "Word of Truth" by which "He begat us to be a certain first-fruits of His creatures."

CHAPTER X

THE BAPTIST AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL

IT is to the Fourth Gospel that we look for the clearing up of the mystery of the Baptist's vacillation which is recorded by the Synoptists. The explanation that the Baptist had lost faith in the Messiahship of Jesus because the method of Jesus did not correspond with his ideas of the Messiah is excluded, as Professor H. H. Wendt rightly observes.[1] But there may, however, be another explanation. Much of the history and hopes of the Baptist is revealed in the saying reported in the Fourth Gospel, "He who sent me to baptize in water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and abiding on Him, He it is who baptizeth in the Holy Spirit."[2] In the heart of that wild figure, whose earnestness was ever at white heat, was treasured up a charge consisting of a message and a promise; and as he did not fail to trumpet forth the one, he did not cease to brood upon the other. This promise was his inspiration. The hope of some day leading to His baptism One who was to confer the spiritual baptism that could purify the heart supported the reformer in his dark hour. The hope of "the Stronger"[3] "Whose shoes he is not worthy to bear;"[4] "the latchet of Whose shoes he is not worthy to stoop

[1] *Das Johannesevangelium*, p. 14.
[2] i. 33.
[3] ὁ ἰσχυρότερος.
[4] Matt. iii. 11.

down and unloose," [1] and whose drastic treatment of the wicked appealed to the soul of the Baptist, is recorded in the Synoptic Gospels. It would appear that the expectation of the Messiah's coming, which was widely spread among all classes, was especially rife among the crowds who gathered round the Baptist; and this very fact, even if there was nothing else behind it, as we believe there was, would explain the Baptist's intense anticipation of Him who was to come.[2] But John, who perhaps alone of all the Evangelists belonged to the inner circle of the Baptist's followers, knew more than others of this hope, and alone records its fulfilment. One day the herald of the spiritual kingdom in his rapt mood had led a Stranger, who perhaps differed in no way from other men except in the air of peace that rested upon Him, to the waters. And as he raised Him up, suddenly the rays of the sun fell upon that tranquil face; and in a moment of ecstasy the Baptist witnessed the realization of his dream. That was the supreme hour of his life. It was an opening of the heavens and the tranquil descent and the permanent abiding of the Spirit upon the Man before him. It was as if a voice was heard proclaiming the coronation and consecration of the King in the words of the Psalmist. And the Baptist, thus apprised of His nature and mission, declares, "I have seen and I have borne my testimony that this is the Son of God." [3] His soul is satisfied. And when he afterwards saw the Stranger pass he said, with a reference to his favourite prophecy of Isaiah, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the World," and then proceeds to explain his previous predictions of the greater One who was to succeed him, whose shoes' latchet he was not worthy to loose,[4] which was uttered when as yet he knew Him not.[5] But now he has met and known Him, and the memory and witness of that vision are

[1] Mark i. 8. [2] Matt. xi. 3. [3] i. 34. [4] i. 27. [5] i. 33.

his life. On the next day he is again standing with two of his disciples, and, looking upon Jesus walking, says, "Behold the Lamb of God;" and his disciples followed the Stranger.

"The Baptist," Canon Sanday remarks, "is represented as repeating his exclamation twice; but on the second occasion the qualifying clause is dropped; the words are only 'Behold the Lamb of God!' Is it not possible that this, or something like it, is all that was actually spoken? Perhaps not so much even as this; but in some way or other we may believe that the Baptist did, as a matter of fact, compare the figure approaching him to a lamb."[1] But if we take into account the fact that the vision had been seen before that testimony, we cannot be without some assurance that language was uttered which was not only sufficiently strong to indicate the Messiahship of the Stranger, but also to induce his own followers to leave him and follow that Stranger. Words uttered on such an occasion, which marked the new crisis or change in a man's career, would of necessity be emphatically spoken and indelibly inscribed on the memory. There is another point. That vision explains the greater grasp the Baptist had of the Divinity of our Lord in the Fourth Gospel than that ascribed to him in the Synoptic narrative. In the latter the successor is his Master whose sandals he is all unworthy to carry; while in the former He is also the Master whose shoes' latchet he is not fit to loose; but He is more, He is before him,[2] and therefore has superseded him; He is "the Son of God,"[3] and He is "the Lamb of God."[4] The Synoptic utterances were made before that strange meeting, baptism, and vision ("I knew Him not," he declares),[5] and the Johannine announcements after. This fact is more evident when one considers that the interest

[1] *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 160. [2] i. 30.
[3] i. 34. [4] i. 36. [5] i. 33.

of the Fourth Evangelist is centred, not in the *preaching* of the Baptist, which so engrossed the attention of the Synoptists that they described it in three different Greek words : κηρύσσων (heralding) ; [1] παρακαλῶν (exhorting) ; [2] εὐηγγελίζετο (preached good news) ; but in the witness, ἡ μαρτυρία, of the Baptist to the Christ to which the Christ Himself appealed,[3] but regarding which He said, " The witness which I have is greater than that of John." Such testimony demonstrates the standpoint of the witness as after the event, when his prophecy or evangel (εὐαγγέλιον) had passed into μαρτύριον (evidence).[4]

This witness was of such paramount importance in the eyes of the writer that the command to repent, the scathing address, " Ye generation of vipers," [5] and the grim parable of the tree and its fruit, which were repeated with telling force by the Master in the Synoptic Gospels, found no place in this. But the mysterious language in which the Baptist described his relation to the Master as " the friend of the Bridegroom," the Old Testament image under which the relation between Yahveh and His people was represented, is repeated in iii. 29, because it was of the nature of witness.

The similarity between the speeches in which the Baptist gives his testimony and the discourses of Jesus in this Gospel may be due either to the fact that the Evangelist reproduced the Baptist's statements, which are of considerable length and are evidently summaries,[6] in the after-light of the revelation of the Word, and recast them in the form in which he reproduced the words of Jesus ; or it may be that the genius of the Baptist's expression may have exercised a subtle influence upon the mind of the Evangelist, and caused him almost unconsciously to adopt his style of speech as he recorded the discourses of the Master. Neither of these

[1] Mark i. 4. [2] Luke iii. 18. [3] John v. 33.
[4] *Cf.* Matt. xxiv. 14. [5] γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν. [6] i. 15–34 ; iii. 27–36.

explanations impugn the veracity of the author; they simply allow play for subjectivity. One reporter will give a more effective but not less reliable summary of a speech than another by expressing its fundamental ideas, of which he retains a vivid recollection, in a more graceful form. And when the speech is recalled through the mists and after the constant repetition of many years it is not improbable that it may contain expressions which were frequently on the speaker's own lips. The λαλία, the form of the utterance may be a variable quantity, while the λόγος, the thought uttered, remains constant.

From the very beginning of the Prologue we see traces of the indelible impression which the Baptist's testimony made upon the mind of the Evangelist—a testimony which was daily receiving fresh confirmation in his own religious experience, and which had induced him to make his own great venture of faith. Of that testimony to "the Lamb of God Who taketh away the sin of the world," the keynote is the very same as that to which the chords of the Gospel are set—the manifestation of the Christ, "that He should be made manifest to Israel; therefore am I come baptizing with water."[1]

The Prologue is the independent work of the Evangelist, but in its lofty strain we catch no distant echo of the first utterance of the Baptist in this Gospel. Compare "the word dwelt among us . . . full of grace and truth"[2] of the Prologue with "grace and truth[3] came through Jesus Christ,"[4] of the Baptist's utterance. Jesus is ὁ μονογενής in both passages. The echoes of the Baptist's witness go on resounding through all the labyrinths of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles in a manner that is aught but casual. "No man hath seen[5] God at any time; the Only-begotten Son which is in the bosom of

[1] i. 31.
[2] πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας. i. 14.
[3] ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθια.
[4] i. 17.
[5] i. 18. ἑώρακε.

the Father, He hath declared Him," saith the Baptist. "No man hath seen [1] God at any time," saith the Apostle in his first Epistle; and in ch. xiv. 7–10 of the Gospel the Master saith, "No man cometh to the Father, but by Me. If ye had known Me, ye should have known My Father also: and from henceforth ye know Him, and have seen Him" . . . Philip saith unto Him, Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou, Shew us the Father?"

"Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away [2] the sin of the world," [3] cried the Baptist; [4] "And He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for (those of) the whole *world*," [5] wrote the Apostle in his first letter; [6] and also, "You know that He was manifested that He might take away [7] our sins, and no sin is in Him."

The Baptist had employed the same word to describe his devout gaze upon the Master [8] which the disciple used to express his thoughtful contemplation of Him whom the Father hath sent to be the Saviour of the world.[9]

"That He should be made manifest [10] to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing in water," said the Baptist. "This beginning of signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested [11] His glory," wrote the Apostle; "And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God," is the concluding sentence of the Baptist's statement,[12] which is re-echoed in the words of the Apostle's first letter; [13] "And we saw and bare record that the Father hath sent the Son."

[1] iv. 12, τεθέαται.
[2] ὁ αἴρων.
[3] τοῦ κόσμου.
[4] John i. 29.
[5] τοῦ κόσμου.
[6] ii. 2.
[7] ἄρῃ. iii. 5
[8] τεθέαμαι. i. 32.
[9] τεθεάμεθα. 1 John iv. 14.
[10] φανερωθῇ. i. 31.
[11] ἐφανέρωσε. ii. 11.
[12] i. 34.
[13] iv. 14.

In both passages the witness of man is represented as proceeding from the vision of God.

Turning to the second speech of the Baptist,[1] we have in verse 30, *αὕτη οὖν ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ πεπλήρωται*, "this my joy therefore has been fulfilled," the original of the Apostle's twice-repeated phrase, "that our joy may be full."[2]

"He that cometh from above"[3] speaks to Nicodemus of the birth "from above."[4] "He that is of the earth is earthy, and speaketh of the earth;[5] He that cometh from heaven is above all," exclaimed the Baptist. "If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?"[6] said Jesus to Nicodemus. "They are of the world, therefore they speak of the world,"[7] wrote the Apostle in his first letter.[8]

"And what He hath seen and heard that He testifieth, and no man receives His testimony,"[9] are the Baptist's words, "Verily, verily. I say unto thee, we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen, and ye receive not our testimony," are the Master's to Nicodemus.[10] And again He said, "Why do you not recognize My speech?[11] Because ye are not able to hear My word?"[12]

"He that hath received His testimony hath set to his seal that God is true," said the Baptist.[13] To this we have a parallel in the First Epistle,[14] "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the testimony in himself; but he that believeth not hath made Him a liar, because he believeth not the testimony which God hath given of His Son."

"For He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God,"[15] are the Baptist's words; "My doctrine[16] is not Mine, but His that sent Me," and "He who

[1] iii. 27–36. [2] 1 John i. 4; 2 John 12. [3] *ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος.*
[4] *ἄνωθεν.* iii. 3. [5] *ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ.* iii. 31. [6] iii. 12.
[7] *ἐκ τοῦ κοσμοῦ λαλοῦσι.* [8] iv. 6.
[9] *μαρτυρίαν.* iii. 32. [10] iii. 11.
[11] *λαλίαν.* [12] *λόγον.* viii. 43. [13] iii. 33. [14] v. 19.
[15] *τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ.* John iii. 34. [16] *διδαχή.* vii. 16.

sent Me is true, and what I heard from Him, these things I say unto the world," [1] are the Master's and "Thou hast words [2] of eternal life," are Peter's.

"For the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand," was the witness of the Baptist; [3] and Jesus said to the Jews, "For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth Him all things that Himself doeth . . . For as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself, and hath given Him authority [4] to execute judgment also." [5] And again in His prayer [6] He said, "As Thou hast given Him authority [7] over all flesh."

"The Father giveth not the Spirit *by measure* [8] unto Him," saith the Baptist. "He is *full* [9] of grace and truth," wrote the Apostle in the Prologue. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life,[10] and he that believeth not the Son shall not *see* [11] life," are the words of the Baptist; [12] while, "Except a man be born from above he cannot see [13] the Kingdom of God;" "He that believeth on Him may not perish, but have everlasting life;" [14] and "He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life," [15] are the words of Jesus; and "This is the testimony, that He hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life," are the words of the Apostle in i. John v. 11. "The wrath of God abideth on him," [16] said the Baptist of the unbeliever; and he likewise said of the Messiah, "I saw the Spirit descending as a dove from heaven, and it abode upon Him." [17]

These resemblances between the Baptist's evi-

[1] viii. 26. [2] *ῥήματα.* vi. 68. [3] iii. 35.
[4] *ἐξουσίαν.* [5] v. 20, 26. [6] xvii. 2.
[7] *ἐξουσίαν.* [8] *ἐκ μέτρου,* iii. 34 [9] *πλήρης.* i. 14.
[10] *ζωὴν αἰώνιον.* iii. 18. [11] *ὄψεται.*
[12] iii. 36. [13] *οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν.* iii. 5 [14] *ζωὴν αἰώνιον.* iii. 18.
[15] vi. 47. [16] *μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν.* iii. 36.
[17] *ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν.* i. 32.

dential utterances and the form in which the Apostle cast the words of his Master and his own reflections are at once a proof of the relationship that existed between the Baptist and his disciples, and the integrity of the Fourth Gospel. The statements of the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel differ, indeed, from the more popular forms of the Baptist's testimony that are enshrined in the Synoptic Gospels, but they preserve certain peculiarities of his prophetic style, the symbolic use of "Lamb" and "Bridegroom," which do not reappear in this Gospel, and his curt and indirect manner of answering questions. It is, indeed, possible that the teaching of the Baptist, who found a congenial pupil in the mystic and enthusiastic John, gave a certain direction and stimulus to the theological mind of the other, and prepared him for the fuller revelation of the Son of God. This would be in accordance with the angel's prediction to Zacharias that his son should go before the Lord "in the spirit and power of Elias." [1]

It was only in the greater and fuller light of the Christ that "the burning and shining lamp" [2] of the Baptist began to wane. It is no wonder that John, the man of vision, who reads the thoughts of men and interprets the purposes of God, and who rejoiced for a season in the light of the Baptist, should turn from the lesser light that ruled the night to the greater light that ruled the day of revelation; but as he turned he carried with him grateful memories of him who beheld the glory of Christ, and who bore a record that was indelibly fastened on his mind, and which may have unconsciously fashioned his mode of expression. And thus the Baptist's voice became in more than one sense the preparer of the way of the Lord.

In the Fourth Gospel, the work of a former disciple of the Baptist, we naturally find much to

[1] Luke i. 15. [2] ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων. v. 35.

rehabilitate the Baptist in the opinions of men. Although he continued to baptize after Jesus had commenced His work, he still continued to testify of Jesus, so that many were prepared to receive the Christ. When the Baptist had been cast into prison, Jesus, who had left his vicinity in order to avoid collisions among their disciples, returned, and many came and said, "John did no sign, but everything that John said about this Man was true. And many believed on Him there." [1] And while in the Synoptists the question, "Art Thou He that cometh, or look we for another?" [2] emanates from John Baptist as challenger, here the testimony to Jesus is evidently borne by John when challenged by the Jews, "Ye sent to John, and he bare witness to the truth." [3]

This testimony of the Baptist to Christ occupies a prominent position in the Gospel. It was owing to his ever vivid impression of that witness that the author twice explains the course of the argument with which he begins his Gospel by a reference to this testimony. These passages, which, according to the partition theory of Dr. H. H. Wendt, are interruptions of the original prologue by the later Evangelist, are thus, to another view, interludes of human music in the Divine Anthem of the Word, necessary links in that great chain of reasoning which is gradually lowered from the heights of existence and light which no man can approach unto or describe, to the levels of human being and thought, until the Word who creates and illuminates stands revealed as an historical figure upon the stage of life. In its broad lines this witness is consistently represented in the four Gospels; while its more special position in the economy of Christian revelation is given by him who alone of the Evangelists could gauge its value and estimate its influence, and whose

[1] John x. 42. [2] Matt. xi. 3.

[3] v. 33.

writings can hardly be said to be actuated by "a polemical interest against the Baptist." [1]

So far is it from this being the case, that it seems most probable that the author of the Fourth Gospel was an intimate disciple of the Baptist. For it is noteworthy that in this Gospel—although it is essentially the Gospel of the Holy Spirit—a Gospel strange to the Ephesian followers of the Baptist[2]—nothing that could in the slightest manner detract from the character and work of the Baptist finds a place. The writer paints him in a softer and more agreeable light and describes his relation to the Messiah as the constant witness of the True Light, perhaps, not so much with a view to prove that the Messianic nature of his successor was known to John as to re-establish the character of the Forerunner. It is the Synoptists that tell us of the Baptist's vacillation and question, "Art Thou He that cometh, or look we for another?" [3] But it is the vision in the Fourth Gospel that explains both the exaltation of the Baptist's faith and its depression. After the two disciples have left his side he continues his work, and when some of his followers, after a discussion with a Jew about purifying, return to him and say, "Rabbi, He that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to Him," he expressed himself in words of resignation and pious reflection. But Jesus withdrew when it was known that His disciples were more numerous than John's, lest He should wound the latter's feelings. Shortly after this the Baptist is cast into prison; and from the soul of the caged prophet the vision he had received fades away. It had helped him to rise above the Jewish aspirations of his time; but within his prison walls the golden hope passes from his grasp. He longs for another revelation, a

[1] Wendt, *Das Johannesevangelium*, p. 226.
[2] Acts xix. 4. [3] Matt. xi. 3.

fresh assurance to fan into flame the dying embers of his faith. The vacillation of the Baptist is thus not "psychologically incomprehensible." [1] For they who rise to the highest heights of hope are prone to sink to lower depths than those who have never soared at all. But it is not the prisoner with his fettered wing, than whom the least in the Kingdom is greater, that the Fourth Evangelist portrays, but the prophet on soaring pinion, with the gleam of a glorious vision upon his brow—"a man sent from God," and come for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men might believe through him,[2] and concerning whom the people said, "John did no sign, but everything John said *regarding this Man* was true." [3]

CHAPTER XI

THE LITERARY CONNEXION BETWEEN ST. JOHN AND ST. PETER

THERE would be a strong case against the veracity of the Evangelical documents, if it could be proved that there was no literary connexion between the works associated with the name, authority and work of St. Peter and that Gospel which is generally ascribed to one who is represented by the Synoptists as the companion and fellow-apostle of St. Peter. On the other hand, there would be a strong argument for the veracity of those records if such a literary connexion could be established. The object of this chapter is to show that a good case can be made out for such a connexion.

In the first place, consider the passage John i. 14, "The Word became flesh and tabernacled [4] among us." This may be regarded as St. John's correction or criticism of St. Peter's utterance, "Let us make

[1] Wendt, *l.c.*, i. 14. [2] i. 6, 7. [3] x. 41. [4] ἐσκήνωσεν.

three tabernacles,"[1] at the Mount of Transfiguration. At any rate, this inference is suggested by the following words, "And we beheld[2] His glory, glory as of the Only-begotten from the Father."[3] The last words undoubtedly recall the Divine utterance, "This is My beloved Son."[4] While it is noticeable that glory[5] occurs twice in the Lukan account, vv. 31, 32. The latter verse, "They saw[6] His glory," is reset by St. John in grander style, "We contemplated His glory." The verb *θεάομαι* implies mental gaze here,[7] and in i. 31, 1 John i. 1.[8] It lifts the occurrence out of the sphere of sensuous phenomena. The connexion might therefore be expressed some way thus: "Make three shrines to worship the Lord, Moses and Elias, when the Lord the Word has taken the whole of humanity, the whole race, for His shrine as He showed upon the Mount, where His true nature in relation to law and prophecy was revealed as the Divine Word or Mediator between God and man, who inspired the ancient script in its ethical and spiritual expressions, and who represented the descending mediation, speaking for God and revealing His mind to man!"

The connexion with the law and the prophets throws fresh light upon the much-disputed term Logos,[9] which had little or no philosophic meaning for St. John. And if tabernacle,[10] twice used in 2 Peter i. 13 f., is Petrine, as the portion of the Epistle

[1] *σκηνάς.* [2] *ἐθεασάμεθα.* [3] *δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ Πατρός.*
[4] Matt. iii. 17; xvii. 4; Luke ix. 33. [5] *δόξα.* [6] Different verb. *εἶδον.*
[7] But Sanday, *Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 26, takes it as referring to bodily, not mental or spiritual vision. He compares 1 John i. 1–3.
[8] *Cf.* Plato, *Phaedrus*, 84 B, where its subject is "the truth."
[9] The Logos in Philo's system, from which St. John may have taken over the term, was the intermediary between God and creation, the messenger of God to man. However, it is more probable that he adopted the *memra* of the Targums, who is described as a redeeming deity (Targ. to Isa. lvi. 13), as God's agent in ruling man (Targ. to Num. xxvii. 16) in judgment (Num. xxiii. 4).
[10] *σκήνωμα.*

in which it occurs seems to be, it would be a significant back-reference to a mysterious experience which had been fraught with solemn thought and pregnant of glorious hope in the life of St. Peter.

In John i. 29, 36, "Behold the *Lamb*[1] of God," it is quite possible that there is a Messianic reference founded on Isa. liii. 7, "As a lamb that is led to the slaughter."[2] And it is equally possible that 1 Peter i. 18 f., "Ye were redeemed not with corruptible things, with silver and gold, from your vain manner of life handed down from your fathers; but with precious blood, as of a *lamb*[3] without blemish and without spot, of Christ," is a reminiscence of the Baptist's word overheard on that occasion by John and Andrew, and repeated to Peter. It would be strange if this startling use of the prophecy of Isaiah, which was agitating the minds of the Jews,[4] made no impression upon the mind of the quick-witted Andrew.

"The Lamb which taketh away the sin of the world,"[5] is the deliverer from a "vain manner of life." It is interesting to note that the Greek word for *lamb* used here does not recur in the Gospels, and it is only found in the New Testament in the three passages discussed. The exegesis does not, however, exclude a reference to the Paschal Lamb, the symbol of redemption. "The Lamb" was the focus of several converging lines of thought in the Jewish sacred writings. It was the central hope of the Baptist, the central figure[6] of the Apocalypse, and the central doctrine of St. Peter's creed. But chiefly was it the central conception of the Fourth Gospel, in which the hour of His death coincided

[1] ἀμνός.

[2] Jeremiah (xi. 19) describes himself as "a gentle lamb (different Hebrew word) that is led to the slaughter."

[3] ἀμνοῦ. [4] See Acts viii. 27–34. [5] i. 29.

[6] A different Greek word (ἀρνίον) is used in the Apocalypse twenty-seven times. That word occurs nowhere else in the New Testament save in John xxi. 15.

with the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb "between the evenings," [1] and He is represented as the Paschal Lamb, "a bone of Him shall not be broken." [2]

Again, would it be straining a point to see a literary connexion between the prophetic utterance, evidently made in the presence of Peter, "You shall see the heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending [3] upon the Son of man," and the form, clearly his own, in which Peter's vision at Joppa is described in Acts x. 11, "He beholds the heaven opened and a certain vessel descending [4] upon him?" It is also to be noted that the word [5] employed to describe St. Peter's vision has a similar mystical sense in the Fourth Gospel, *e.g.* "Beholding [6] the Son," "Behold [7] death."

In John iii. 25, we hear of a discussion between a Jew and the disciples of John on the subject of purification [8]—baptismal purification is implied in the context. To such purification we have a very probable reference in 2 Peter i. 9, "Having forgotten the purification [9] of his old sins."

The springing water [10] of John iv. 14, recalls the fact that the only other passage in which this Greek participle occurs is Acts iii. 8, "Leaping up . . . leaping," [11] where St. John and St. Peter are together. It is true that the verb occurs again in Acts xiv. 19, but not in the participial form. It is also remarkable that an almost Johannean word occurs in Acts iii. 7, "and taking (or grasping) [12] him by the right hand," and is used to describe the arrest of St. Peter in Acts xii. 4.

In John v. 4, "the troubling" [13] of the water

[1] Ex. xii. 6.

[2] John xix. 36 (*cf.* Ex. xii. 46): *cf.* also 1 Cor. v. 7, "Christ our Passover (*i.e.* Paschal Lamb) is sacrificed for us."

[3] καταβαίνοντας. i. 51. [4] καταβαῖνον. [5] θεωρῶ.

[6] θεωρῶν. vi. 40. [7] θεωρήσῃ. viii. 51. [8] καθαρισμός.

[9] καθαρισμός. [10] ὕδατος ἁλλομένου. [11] ἐξαλλόμενος ἁλλόμενος.

[12] πιάσας. Occurs eight times in the Fourth Gospel, twice in Acts, once in Corinthians. [13] ταραχή.

reminds us of the fact that the only other passage where this Greek word occurs is Mark xiii. 8, where it is rendered "troubles." [1] But neither passage is considered genuine by the revisers. The verb "to be troubled," [2] however, constitutes a link between St. Peter and the Gospel. "Let not your heart be troubled" [3] is echoed in 1 Peter iii. 14, "Neither be troubled." [4] It is remarkable that fear is combined with trouble and heart in John xiv. 27, "Let not your *heart* be *troubled*, neither let it be *afraid*," [5] and in 1 Peter iii. 14, "Be not afraid [6] of their terror, neither be *troubled*, but sanctify the Lord God in your *hearts*." In the Fourth Gospel it is used three times of our Lord's own trouble, "And He troubled Himself;" [7] "My soul is troubled;" [8] "He was troubled in spirit." [9]

"Take up thy bed," [10] John v. 8, 11, recalls the similar order in Mark ii. 9, 11. In Acts ix. 33, Peter finds Æneas lying on a bed.[11] In Acts v. 15, the sick are placed on beds [12] in order that St. Peter's shadow might fall upon them. And in Mark vi. 55, we read that they began to carry around the sick on beds.[13] It is interesting to note that this word for bed, *κράββατος*, occurs five times in the Second Gospel, five times in the Fourth, twice in the Acts, but nowhere else in the New Testament. Another word that occurs twice in the Fourth and twice in the Second Gospel, but nowhere else in the New Testament, is "boat (*πλοιάριον*)."

In John vi. 63, we have a passage that is echoed in the first of St. Peter's letters. There our Lord said, "It is the spirit that giveth life,[14] the flesh profiteth nothing." St. Peter took a prominent part in this scene.[15] In 1 Peter iii. 18, our Lord is

[1] *ταραχαί.* [2] *ταράσσομαι.* [3] *μὴ ταρασσέσθω.* xiv. 1.
[4] *μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε.* [5] *δειλιάτω.* [6] *φοβηθῆτε.*
[7] *ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν.* xi. 33. [8] *τετάρακται.* xii. 27. [9] *ἐταράχθη.*
[10] *τὸν κράββατον.* [11] *ἐπὶ κραββάτου.* [12] *ἐπὶ κραββάτων.*
[13] *κραββάτοις.* [14] *τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιοῦν.*
[15] See ver. 68, "Then answered Simon Peter to Him, Lord, to whom shall we go?"

described as " put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit " [1] which may be regarded as an undesigned literary link between St. Peter and this Gospel.

John vii. 4 introduces an interesting word which in the days of Demosthenes corresponded with our " freedom of the press "—I mean freedom of speech.[2] This forms another link between St. Peter and the Fourth Gospel. In Mark viii. 32 (the only Synoptic passage where the word occurs) our Lord revealed His purpose to His disciples—" He spoke that saying *openly* " [3]—whereupon Peter rebukes Him. In John vii. 4, His brethren rebuke Him, " for no one does aught in secret and desires himself (or it) to be talked about." [4] In Acts ii. 29, St. Peter speaks " freely." [5] In Acts iv. 13, the Jews perceive " the boldness " [6] of St. Peter and St. John. In Acts iv. 29, the company of the disciples formed by St. Peter and St. John pray that they may have power to speak the word of God " with boldness," [7] and in iv. 31, we read that they did speak the word of God " with boldness." [8] This expression may therefore form another literary link between these Apostles who proved such doughty champions of liberty of speech.

In John vii. 35, the word " dispersion " [9] occurs. It is also found in 1 Peter i. 1, and James i. 1, but nowhere else in the New Testament. In John vii. 52, also v. 39, the word " search " [10] occurs, but nowhere else in the Gospels. It is also found in Rev. ii. 23 ; Rom. viii. 27 ; 1 Cor. ii. 10, and 1 Peter i. 10, 11, " searched diligently . . . searching." [11] The word for conscience [12] occurs but once in the Gospels, and that in the *pericope adulteræ*.[13] It is also found in the Pauline and Pastoral Epistles, and in 1 Peter ii. 19 ; iii. 16, 21. This fact supports Holtzman's

[1] ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ τῷ πνεύματι. [2] παῤῥησία.
[3] παῤῥησίᾳ ἐλάλει. [4] ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ εἶναι. [5] μετὰ παῤῥησίας.
[6] παῤῥησιαν. [7] μετὰ παῤῥησίας. [8] *Ibid.*
[9] ἡ διασπορά. [10] ἐρεύνησον.
[11] ἐξηρεύνησαν . . . ἔρευνῶντες. [12] ἡ συνείδησις. [13] viii. 1–11.

view that this passage belongs to the "Ur-Marcus" document coming after Mark xii. 17.

In John viii. 29, we have a word "pleasing" [1] which recurs in 1 John iii. 22, and in Acts vi. 2, the words of the twelve, and xii. 3, of St. Peter's arrest: "When he saw that it pleased the Jews he proceeded to seize Peter also." Peter was very possibly the authority for both these passages in the Acts.

An important link is found in John viii. 56, "He rejoiced . . . and was glad." [2] With this compare Matthew v. 12 (Sermon on Mount), "Rejoice and be glad;" [3] and 1 Peter iv. 13, "Ye may be glad, being overjoyed." [4] The A. V. and R. V. have lost this connexion by rendering "with exceeding joy." See also Rev. xix. 7, "Let us be glad and rejoice." [5] Compare also 1 Peter i. 8, "Ye rejoiced with joy," [6] and Acts ii. 26, St. Peter's speech after Psalm xvi. 9, "My tongue rejoiced." [7] The appearance of this doublet in the Sermon on the Mount, our Lord's speech in John viii. 56, and St. Peter's First Epistle, is a coincidence which requires explanation.

The scene of the blind beggar in John ix. has an interesting variant in ver. 8, *beggar* [8] for *blind* [9] which has been adopted by R. V. Both words are connected in Mark x. 46, where "blind beggar" is read by R. V. and "blind" by A. V. In the same scene [10] they *reviled* him [11] has a connexion with 1 Peter ii. 23, "Who being reviled, reviled not again," [12] and with 1 Peter iii. 9, "reviling for reviling." [13] It also occurs in Acts xxiii. 4, and 1 Cor. iv. 12.

[1] ἀρεστός.
[2] ἠγαλλιάσατο . . . καὶ ἐχάρη
[3] Same Greek verbs.
[4] χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι.
[5] Same Greek verbs. χαιρῶμεν καὶ ἀγαλλιῶμεν.
[6] ἀγαλλιᾶσθε χαρᾷ.
[7] ἠγαλλιάσατο.
[8] προσαίτης.
[9] τυφλός.
[10] ix. 28.
[11] ἐλοιδόρησαν.
[12] λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιδόρει.
[13] λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ λοιδορίας.

In John xi. 9, 10, we have the word "stumble" [1] used without object, or *simpliciter*. In 1 Peter ii. 8 we have a similar use, "they stumble, being disobedient to the word." [2] Grimm renders "stumble at the word;" so R. V., but see margin. Grimm quotes Rom. ix. 32, "They stumbled at the stone" [3] in support. But the order of the passage 1 Peter ii. 8, shows that "stumbling," [4] not "word," is the antecedent of "unto which," [5] and that "stumble" is not therefore to be taken with "word."

The following parallels are also to be noted: John xii. 3, "genuine," or "unadulterated," [6] also in xii. 7 and Mark xiv. 8, nowhere else in the New Testament; John xii. 3, "nard," also in Mark xiv. 3, nowhere else in the New Testament; "entombment," [7] John xii. 7, and Mark xiv. 8, nowhere else in New Testament; "thunder," [8] John xii. 29, cf. Mark iii. 17, where James and John are called "sons of thunder." [9] This word occurs nine times in the Apocalypse, but nowhere else in the New Testament. Again, "the way and the truth" of John xiv. 6 may find an echo in 2 Peter ii. 2, "the way of truth." The Greek word for "porter" [10] is only found in Mark xiii. 34 (masc.), John x. 3 (masc.), xxiii. 16, 17 (fem.).

But it is the final scenes with which the Fourth Gospel associates both Apostles that we find the most conspicuous points of attachment between the Gospels of St. John and St. Mark and the First Epistle of St. Peter. For example, "warming himself" [11] is used of St. Peter in John xviii. 18, and also in Mark xiv. 54, 67. The participle occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and the verb only in James ii. 16 and John xviii. 18. The incident referred to could only have been known to two of the disciples whose authority is associated

[1] προσκόπτειν. [2] προσκόπτουσι τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες.
[3] προσέκοψὰν τῷ λίθῳ. [4] πρόσκομμα. [5] εἰς ὃ.
[6] πιστικός. [7] ἐνταιφἀσμός. [8] βροντή.
[9] βοανεργές, υἱοὶ βροντῆς. [10] θυρωρός. [11] θερμαινόμενος.

with the only documents in which it is found. This is clearly a link between those documents. John xviii. 15, "into the hall of the high priest," is also found in Mark xiv. 54.[1] The "blow" [2] of John xviii. 22, and John xix. 3 (blows), and Mark xiv. 65 (blows), forms another link. It is to be noticed that in Mark xiv. 65 and John xviii. 22, it was the action of the *attendants* of the high priest. The word does not recur in the New Testament. And if the question were asked, "Who would be likely to record that blow or blows?" the answer would be, "Those who are represented as having witnessed it or them." Another detail which must have impressed both witnesses of their Master's trials was the offensive name, "evil-doer," [3] with which the Jews described our Lord to Pilate. We find it recorded in John xviii. 30,[4] and the word occurs frequently in the First Epistle of St. Peter,[5] and nowhere else in the New Testament. 1 Peter ii. 14, "or unto governors [6] as unto those that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers," [7] may have a reference to Pilate, who is described as "governor" [8] in Matthew xxvii. 27, and to the Lord's own prediction, "Ye shall be brought before *governors* [9] and kings for My sake," Mark xiii. 9. The crown of thorns,[10] John xix. 5, also in Mark xv. 17, occurs nowhere else in this adjectival form in the New Testament. "Of thorns" [11] occurs in Matthew xxvii. 29 and John xix. 2. St. Peter's impression of the trial is given in 1 Peter ii. 23, "Who, when He was reviled, reviled not again; when He suffered, threatened not, but committed Himself [12] to Him that judgeth righteously." The perfect resignation of the Master's death is expressed by the same verb "gave

[1] Matt. xxvi. 3, is evidently borrowed from Mark xiv. 54.
[2] *βάπισμα.* [3] *κακοποιός.*
[4] Westcott and Hort read *κακὸν ποιῶν.*
[5] ii. 12, 14; iii. 16; iv. 15. [6] *ἡγεμόσιν.*
[7] *κακοποιῶν.* [8] *ἡγεμών.* [9] *ἡγεμόνων.*
[10] *ἀκάνθινος.* [11] *ἐξ ἀκανθῶν.* [12] *παρεδίδου.*

up [1] His spirit," in John xix. 30. Compare also Gal. ii. 20 ; Eph. v. 2, 25, of our Lord's self-surrender in death.

Finally, we have " Feed *My* lambs," [2] " Shepherd [3] *My* sheep," [4] " Feed *My* sheep " are significant words. In the first place, notice that ἀμνός (lamb) is not used. The employment of a less familiar word may be explained by the previous use of the word in a higher connexion, as in John i. 29, "Behold the Lamb of God." This touch, slight as it is, betrays unity of authorship. Then in 1 Peter ii. 25, we have an echo of this commission, " For you were as sheep [5] going astray, but are now returned unto the shepherd [6] and bishop of your souls." The sheep belong to the shepherd (our Lord emphasizes this fact three times in His commission to Peter) in contrast with the hireling shepherd, " whose *own* [7] the sheep are not." [8] He is the good and true Shepherd.[9] But he puts others in temporary charge of His flock. St. Peter's words, quoted above, indicate his recognition of this fact. Compare Augustine, " If you love Me, do not think that you are shepherd, but feed My sheep as Mine and not as thine ; seek My glory in them, not thine." [10] Both Matthew [11] and Mark [12] quote the prophecy of Zech. xiii. 7, " Strike the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock will be scattered," with slight variations, while John xvi. 32, " The hour is coming and even now has come, that ye shall be scattered, each to *his own*,[13] and shall leave Me alone "—Him to Whom the sheep belong, for they are *His very own* [14]—is a more pathetic reference to it. It would, indeed, be remarkable if St. Peter, whose protestation of loyalty and the prophecy of whose denial are placed in close connection by both

[1] παρέδωκε.
[2] ἀρνία.
[3] ποίμαινε . . . πρόβατα.
[4] xxi. 16, 18.
[5] πρόβατα.
[6] τὸν ποιμένα.
[7] ἴδια.
[8] x. 12.
[9] x. 11.
[10] *In Joan.*, 123–125.
[11] xxvi. 31.
[12] xiv. 27.
[13] τὰ ἴδια.
[14] τὰ ἴδια. x. 3, 4.

Mark and Matthew (borrowing from Mark) with our Lord's citation of Zechariah, which is developed in John x. and xvi. 32, did not refer to the wandering sheep. And this reference he makes in the above passage, where he represents his Master as still *the* Shepherd, and still the overseer and bishop of the souls of His flock, who has never resigned, but who ever delegates His office to others.

There may be other explanations for these literary phenomena, but surely not the least rational is this that the Apostles were actually associated with those scenes in which they are represented, now by the Synoptists and now by the Fourth Evangelist, as having been among the chief actors. And the corollary of this conclusion would be another argument for the genuineness of the documents concerned.

THE END.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED, LONDON AND BECCLES.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA. Fcap. 8vo. Cloth boards. 3*s.*

"An excellent account of the surroundings, the writings, the teaching and life of a truly lovable man. Among many well-arranged topics are the account of Alexandria, Clement's relation to the teaching of Philo and the Jews, the Gnostics, early Christian customs, Asceticism, Clement's teaching on the Incarnation, the Bible, and the Sacraments, with a carefully executed reconstruction of Clement's creed."—*The Guardian.*

"A model handbook for English students of the Fathers . . . brightly written, well set out and full of matter."—*London Quarterly Review.*

THE PRESENT CONTROVERSY ON PRAYER. Crown 8vo. Cloth boards. 2*s.*

"The book will clear away many doubts and furnish much encouragement to humble and believing minds. It is a sensible and reasonable survey of the whole question."—*London Quarterly Review.*

"An attempt to answer the philosophical, scientific, and experimental objections to prayer. Sound argument and reverent conviction go hand in hand, and we feel the writer makes his points."—*The Churchman.*

ST. AUGUSTINE'S CITY OF GOD. A Translation with Notes. New and Revised Edition. Small post 8vo. Cloth boards. 1*s.* 6*d.*

"Most efficiently edited . . . introduction excellent . . . of great interest and value to students."—*London Quarterly Review.*

"Indicates the greatest care in the way of an exact translation.—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.

Illustrated Handbooks of Art History of all Ages and Countries.

Edited by Sir E. J. POYNTER, P.R.A., and Professor T. ROGER SMITH, F.R.I.B.A.

Large crown 8vo, cloth boards. 2s. 6d. each.

Architecture: Classic and Early Christian. By Professor T. ROGER SMITH and JOHN SLATER, B.A.

Architecture: Gothic and Renaissance. By Professor ROGER SMITH and Sir E. J. POYNTER, P.R.A.

Sculpture: Egyptian, Assyrian, Greek, and Roman. By G. REDFORD, F.R.C.S.

Sculpture: Gothic Renaissance and Modern. By LEADER SCOTT.

Painting: Classic and Italian. By Sir EDWARD J. POYNTER, P.R.A., and PERCY R. HEAD, B.A.

Painting: Spanish and French. By GERARD SMITH.

Painting: German, Flemish, and Dutch. By H. J. WILMOT BUXTON, M.A., and Sir EDWARD J. POYNTER, P.R.A.

Painting: English and American. By H. J. WILMOT BUXTON, M.A., and S. R. KOEHLER.

Water-Colour Painting in England. By G. R. REDGRAVE.

[*The authors' names in this series of Art Handbooks are a guarantee of the excellence of the works, and the large area covered renders them especially interesting to English readers. One can get here information on the art of all countries and times.*]

Diocesan Histories.

This Series furnishes a library of English Ecclesiastical History.

Fcap. 8vo, with Map, cloth boards.

Bath and Wells. By the Rev. W. HUNT. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Canterbury. By the late Rev. R. C. JENKINS. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Carlisle. By the late RICHARD S. FERGUSON. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Chester. By the Rev. Canon MORRIS, D.D. 3*s.*

Chichester. By the Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, M.A. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Durham. By the Rev. J. L. LOW. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Hereford. By the late Rev. Canon PHILLOTT. 3*s.*

Lichfield. By the Rev. W. BERESFORD. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Lincoln. By the late Rev. Canon E. VENABLES, and the late Venerable Archdeacon PERRY. 4*s.*

Llandaff. By the Rev. E. J. NEWELL, M.A. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Norwich. By the Rev. A. JESSOPP, D.D. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Oxford. By the Rev. E. MARSHALL, M.A. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Peterborough. By the Rev. G. A. POOLE, M.A. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Rochester. By the Rev. A. J. PEARMAN, M.A. 4*s.*

Salisbury. By the Rev. W. H. JONES. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Sodor and Man. By A. W. MOORE, M.A. 3*s.*

St. Asaph. By the Venerable Archdeacon THOMAS. 2*s.*

St. David's. By the Rev. Canon BEVAN. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Winchester. By the Rev. W. BENHAM, B.D. 3*s.*

Worcester. By the Rev. I. GREGORY SMITH, M.A., and the Rev. PHIPPS ONSLOW, M.A. 3*s.* 6*d.*

York. By the Rev. Canon ORNSBY, M.A. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Non-Christian Religious Systems.

These Manuals furnish in a brief and popular form an accurate account of the great Non-Christian Religious Systems of the World.

Fcap. 8vo, cloth boards. 2s. 6d. each.

Buddhism: being a Sketch of the Life and Teachings of Gautama, the Buddha. By T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, M.A., Ph.D. A new and revised edition. With Map.

Buddhism in China. By the late Rev. S. BEAL. With Map.

Confucianism and Taouism. By Sir ROBERT K. DOUGLAS, of the British Museum. With Map.

Hinduism. By the late Sir M. MONIER WILLIAMS, M.A., D.C.L. A new and revised edition. With Map.

Islam and its Founder. By J. W. H. STOBART. With Map.

Islam as a Missionary Religion. By C. R. HAINES. (2s.)

Studies of Non-Christian Religions. By ELIOT HOWARD.

The Corân: its Composition and Teaching, and the Testimony it bears to the Holy Scriptures. By Sir WILLIAM MUIR, K.C.S.I., LL.D., D.C.L., Ph.D. A new and revised edition.

The Historical Development of the Qurân. By the Rev. EDWARD SELL, D.D., M.R.A.S.

The Religion of the Crescent; or, Islam: its Strength, its Weakness, its Origin, its Influence. By the Rev. W. ST. CLAIR-TISDALL, M.A., C.M.S. (4s.)

The Fathers for English Readers.

Fcap. 8vo, cloth boards. 2s. each.

Boniface. By the Rev. Canon Gregory Smith, M.A. (1s. 6d.)

Clement of Alexandria. By the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, B.D. (3s.)

Gregory the Great. By the late Rev. J. Barmby, B.D.

Leo the Great. By the Right Rev. Charles Gore, D.D.

Saint Ambrose: his Life, Times, and Teaching. By the Rev. R. Thornton, D.D.

Saint Athanasius: his Life and Times. By the Rev. R. Wheler Bush. (2s. 6d.)

Saint Augustine. By late Rev. E. L. Cutts, D.D.

Saint Basil the Great. By Rev. R. T. Smith, B.D.

Saint Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, A.D. 1091-1153. By the Rev. S. J. Eales, M.A., D.C.L. (2s. 6d.)

Saint Hilary of Poitiers and Saint Martin of Tours. By the Rev. Gibson Cazenove, D.D.

Saint Jerome. By late Rev. E. L. Cutts, D.D.

Saint John of Damascus. By the Rev. J. H. Lupton, M.A.

Saint Patrick: his Life and Teaching. By the Rev. E. J. Newell, M.A. (2s. 6d.)

Synesius of Cyrene, Philosopher and Bishop. By Alice Gardner.

The Apostolic Fathers. By the Rev. Canon Scott Holland.

The Defenders of the Faith; or, the Christian Apologists of the Second and Third Centuries. By the Rev. F. Watson, D.D.

The Venerable Bede. By the Right Rev. G. F. Browne.

Miscellaneous Publications.

Bible Places; or, The Topography of the Holy Land. By H. B. TRISTRAM. New Edition, brought up to date. With Map and numerous Woodcuts. Crown 8vo, half bound, 5*s*.

Called to be Saints. The Minor Festivals Devotionally Studied. By the late CHRISTINA G. ROSSETTI, Author of "Seek and Find." Post 8vo, cloth boards, 3*s*. 6*d*.

Christians under the Crescent in Asia. By the late Rev. E. L. CUTTS, D.D., Author of "Turning-Points of Church History," etc. With numerous Illustrations. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 5*s*.

Christian Worship. Its Origin and Evolution. A Study of the Latin Liturgy up to the time of Charlemagne. By Monsignore DUCHESNE. Translated by M. L. MCCLURE. Third English Edition, representing the Fourth and latest French edition of "Les Origines du Culte Chrétien." Demy 8vo, cloth boards, 10*s*.

Devotional (A) Life of our Lord. By the late Rev. E. L. CUTTS, D.D., Author of "Pastoral Counsels," etc. Post 8vo, cloth boards, 5*s*.

Doctrina Romanensium de Invocatione Sanctorum. Being a brief inquiry into the Principles that underlie the Practice of the Invocation of Saints. By the Rev. H. F. STEWART, B.D. With an Introduction by the BISHOP OF SALISBURY. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2*s*. 6*d*.

Gospels, The Four. Arranged in the Form of an English Harmony, from the Text of the Authorised Version. By the late Rev. J. M. FULLER, M.A. With Analytical Table of Contents and Four Maps. Cloth boards, 1*s*.

Golden Age of the Church, The. By the Very Rev. H. D. M. SPENCE-JONES, M.A., D.D., Dean of Gloucester. Demy 8vo. With Map, cloth boards, 6*s*.

"Higher Criticism," The, and the Verdict of the Monuments. By the Rev. Professor A. H. SAYCE. Seventh Edition. Demy 8vo, bevelled boards, 5*s*.

Inspiration. By the late Rev. FREDERICK WATSON, D.D. Demy 8vo, cloth boards, 4*s*.

Land of Israel, The. A Journal of Travel in Palestine, undertaken with special reference to its Physical Character. By the Rev. Canon TRISTRAM. With two Maps and numerous Illustrations. Large post 8vo, cloth boards, 10*s*. 6*d*.

Literary Criticism and the New Testament. The Manchester Cathedral Lectures, 1907. By the Rev. Canon R. J. KNOWLING, D.D. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 2*s*.

Modern Criticism and the Book of Genesis. By the Rev. H. A. REDPATH, D.Litt., M.A. Second Edition, Revised. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1*s*. 6*d*.

Old Testament in Modern Light, The. By the late W. ALLAN MOBERLY, Canon of Southwark. With a Preface by the BISHOP OF SOUTHWARK. Fcap. 8vo, cloth boards, 1*s*. 6*d*.

Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia, The. By THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S. With several Illustrations. Third Edition with Appendices. Large post 8vo, cloth boards, 7*s*. 6*d*.

Our Lord's Virgin Birth and the Criticism of To-day. By the Rev. Canon R. J. KNOWLING, D.D. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 1*s*. 6*d*.

Paley's Evidences. With Notes, Appendix, and Preface. By Rev. E. A. LITTON. Post 8vo, cloth, 4*s.*

Paley's Horæ Paulinæ. With Notes, Appendix, and Preface. By the Rev. J. S. HOWSON, D.D., Dean of Chester. Post 8vo, cloth boards, 3*s.*

Parables of the Old Testament, The. By the Right Rev. A. BARRY, D.D. Demy 8vo, cloth boards, 4*s.*

Plain Words for Christ. Being a Series of Readings for Working Men. By the late Rev. R. G. DUTTON. Post 8vo, cloth boards, 1*s.*

Prayer of Christendom, The Great. By the late Mrs. RUNDLE CHARLES. Post 8vo, cloth boards, 1*s.*

Readings on the First Lessons for Sundays and Chief Holy Days. According to the New Table. By the late Rev. PETER YOUNG. Crown 8vo, in two volumes, 5*s.*

Reasons for Faith. And other Contributions to Christian Evidence. By the Right Rev. A. F. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, D.D., Bishop of London. Small post 8vo, cloth boards, 2*s.*

Sacraments of the Gospel, The. Lecture Addresses by the Rev. W. BECK. Fcap. 8vo, cloth boards, 1*s.* 6*d.*

Seek and Find. A Double Series of Short Studies of the Benedicite. By the late CHRISTINA G. ROSSETTI. Post 8vo, cloth boards, 1*s.* 6*d.*

"Sound Words." Their Form and Spirit. Addresses on the English Prayer-book. By the late Rev. GEORGE EDWARD JELF, D.D. Large crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3*s.* 6*d.*

"To Whom Shall We Go?" An Examination of some difficulties presented by unbelief. By the Very Rev. C. T. Ovenden, D.D. Small post 8vo, cloth 2*s.* 6*d.*

Thoughts for Men and Women. The Lord's Prayer. By Emily C. Orr. Post 8vo, limp cloth, 1*s.*

Thoughts for Quiet Days. By Emily C. Orr, Author of "The Magic of Sympathy," etc. Small post 8vo, cloth boards, 1*s.*

Thoughts for Working Days. Original and Selected. By Emily C. Orr. Post 8vo, limp cloth, 1*s.*

Time Flies: A Reading Diary. By the late Christina G. Rossetti. Post 8vo, cloth boards, 3*s.* 6*d.*

True Vine, The. By the late Mrs. Rundle Charles. Printed in red and black. Post 8vo, cloth boards, 1*s.*

Turning-Points of English Church History. By the late Rev. E. L. Cutts, D.D. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Turning-Points of General Church History. By the late Rev. E. L. Cutts, D.D. Crown 8vo, cloth boards, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Verses. By the late Christina G. Rossetti. Reprinted from "Called to be Saints," "Time Flies," and "The Face of the Deep." Small post 8vo, boards, 3*s.* 6*d.*

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
London: Northumberland Avenue, W.C.